LITERARY-CRITICAL STUDIES IN THE GILGAMESH EPIC: AN ASSYRIOLOGICAL CONTRIBUTION TO BIBLICAL LITERARY CRITICISM

Jeffrey H. Tigay

1971

A Dissertation Presented to the Faculty of
the Graduate School of Yale University in
Candidacy for the Degree of Doctor of
Philosophy.

XUM

PLEASE NOTE:

Some pages may have

indistinct print.

Filmed as received.

University Microfilms, A Xerox Education Company

XUM

ABSTRACT

Since the seventeenth century it has become axiomatic that Biblical literature as we have it is the end-product of a long evolution, in the course of which individual traditions underwent many modifications in form and content, and that many of the present narratives combine traditions or even documentary sources which were originally independent and at times wholly unrelated to each other. Since copies of the supposed earlier sources and versions have almost never become available, they remain hypothetical constructs, and Biblical criticism may be characterized for this reason as theoretical. In cuneiform studies, on the other hand, earlier sources and versions are available, thus permitting empirical literary criticism. The present dissertation is undertaken to satisfy a Biblist's interest in discovering what can be learned about literary evolution in a field where conditions permit empirical investigation.

The Introduction describes several areas in which empirical investigation is possible in cuneiform literary criticism and briefly discusses the applicability of cuneiform materials to Biblical literary criticism. In the following chapters the Gilgamesh Epic is chosen to exemplify cuneiform literary criticism. Ch. I discusses several questions relating to the literary history of the epic as a whole, including the Sumerian sources of its individual episodes, the date of their integration into a unified epic and the means by which the integration was achieved, the framework and the structure of the epic, and the literary classification of the epic and its Sumerian forerunners. Ch. II-VI examine four pericopes of the epic and seek to discover their literary affinities and antecedents. The end of Ch. VI discusses why some of the antecedent material was drawn upon in the epic and how it relates to the epic's values. The Summary and Conclusions review the foregoing and discuss the relation of the present studies to modern Biblical and general literary criticism, including such areas as source criticism, redactorial creativity, and intercultural literary borrowing.

XUM

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

It is my pleasant duty to thank here several people who contributed in various ways to the preparation of this dissertation.

Prof. A. Leo Oppenheim offered his advice on a number of questions and he and Prof. E. Reiner enabled me to use the files of the Chicago Assyrian Dictionary when I visited the Oriental Institute in December, 1970. Prof. Oppenheim has kindly responded to a number of requests for lexical information, as has Prof. Th. Jacobsen of Harvard for information regarding his views on part of the Gilgamesh Epic. Dr. E. Sollberger of the British Museum responded with much-appreciated speed to two requests for collations. Profs. E. Leichty, Å. Sjöberg, and especially B. Eichler have kindly brought to my attention and made available to me materials at the University Museum, Philadelphia.

To my teachers of Assyriology at Yale, Profs. J. J. Finkelstein and W. W. Hallo, I am indebted not only for what they have taught me, but also for the interest they stimulated in the type of questions this dissertation investigates. Prof. H. A. Hoffner, Jr., was more than generous with his time and advice regarding Hittite matters, though he is not responsible for the use to which I put that advice. Prof. H. Tadmor, Visiting Professor of Assyriology at Yale in the spring of 1971, kindly discussed with me a number of questions both general and specific.

To Prof. Hallo, who served as Director of this dissertation, I am indebted in countless ways for time unstintingly given, for criticism which was always constructive, and for helpful suggestions always offered and never imposed. His manner with his students can best be described as a fulfillment of Shammai's third dictum in Aboth I, 15.

My wife Helene aided me by typing drafts of several sections, compiling the initial bibliography (the need for a supplemental bibliography was not due to any oversight on her part), and by reviewing and criticising several parts of the first draft. I owe her far more for the patience she has cheerfully displayed and the fullness she and our sons Eytan and Hillel have brought into my life during the long years of graduate study.

Finally, for help of a different sort, I wish to express my gratitude to Yale University, the Memorial Foundation for Jewish Culture, and especially the National Foundation for Jewish Culture, for their generous financial aid during the last three years.

CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS. ii

CONTENTS. iv

INTRODUCTION. Cuneiform Models for Biblical Literary Criticism 1-75

A. Empirical vs. theoretical criticism. 1

B. Materials for recensional history. 5

C. Evidence of compositeness. 11

D. Intercultural literary borrowing 22

E. Previous statements on our subject 30

F. The direction of future research 39

G. The relevance of Mesopotamian materials for Biblical literary criticism. 44

NOTES TO INTRODUCTION. 58

Ch. I. The Literary Criticism of the Gilgamesh Epic . 76-130

A. The Sources of the Epic. 77

B. The Origin of the Integrated Epic. 84

C. The Framework. 96

D. Literary Classification. 107

NOTES TO CH. I 117

Ch. II. The Beginnings of Gilgamesh and Enkidu (GE I, ii, 1-41). 131-157

A. Texts

1. The Late Recension 131

2. The Hittite Version. 138

3. Old Babylonian Material. 142

B. Literary Antecedents and Affinities:
Suggestions to date. 145

NOTES TO CH. II. 154

Ch. III. Literary Antecedents and Affinities of the Creation of Gilgamesh. 158-176

Excursus. A Late Account of the Creation of Gilgamesh. 168

NOTES TO CH. III 172

Ch. IV. Literary Antecedents and Affinities of the Oppression of Uruk. 177-220

A. Corvée 177

B. Jus Primae Noctis. 192

C. The Evidence of the Hittite Version. 194

D. The pukku incident 199

E. Summary. 206

NOTES TO CH. IV. 208

Ch. V. Literary Antecedents and Affinities of the Creation of Enkidu 221-229

NOTES TO CH. V 228

Ch. VI. Literary Antecedents and Affinities of the Early Life of Enkidu 230-272

A. Amorites 230

B. Curses 232

C. Primordial Man 234
D. Enkidu's Early Life and the Values of the Epic. .252
NOTES TO CH. VI. 261
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS 273
NOTES TO SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS 285
BIBLIOGRAPHY. 287-316

Introduction.
Cuneiform Models for Biblical Literary Criticism

A. Empirical vs. theoretical criticism

Since the seventeenth century it has become axiomatic that Biblical literature as we have it is the end-product of a long evolution, in the course of which individual traditions underwent many modifications in form and content; and that many of the present narratives combine traditions or even documentary sources which were originally independent and at times wholly unrelated to each other.[1] These conclusions were largely based on critical analysis of Biblical literature, rather than discovery of copies of the original sources or earlier forms of the narratives. Only in a few cases does the Hebrew Bible itself preserve what are unquestionably earlier and later forms of the same narrative, such as in Samuel-Kings and Chronicles.[2] In some other cases the ancient versions reflect earlier recensions of Biblical books which differ from the masoretic, as in the case of the Greek translation of Jeremiah.[3] The same is true of some of the Biblical manuscripts from Qumran.[4] But by and large, Biblical literary criticism has had to rely on internal analysis of the individual books themselves.[5]

The degree of subjectivity which such a procedure permits is manifest. It is therefore no surprise that although the documentary hypothesis, for example, is still dominant in Pentateuchal study,[6] it has to this day remained the target of serious attacks.[7] Form criticism, which has achieved a position of equal prominence in Biblical studies and which includes much of the tradition-history work done today,[8] has been described even by some of its most prominent practitioners as having reached a point of diminishing returns.[9] Because of their reliance on internal evidence alone these types of Biblical criticism reached their inherent limits relatively soon after their conception.

In order to escape these limitations Biblical criticism turned at times to indirect evidence garnered from the literary history of other cultures.[10] Modern Pentateuchal and Homeric criticism grew symbiotically from the start, so that new theories in each field were soon reflected in the other.[11] Even the conservative responses to literary criticism were at times based on classical and oriental literary history.[12] In more recent decades the oral tradition school has relied heavily on non-Israelite models from Arabia, Iran, Greece, and as far away as Iceland.[13] The distance in time and/or space of these models from Biblical Israel has been one of the chief impediments to the wider acceptance of the theories associated with them.[14]

Ancient Mesopotamia is free of this impediment, and in view of the numerous parallels and affinities ancient Israel shares with Mesopotamia at almost every level of culture it is no surprise that scholars have begun to look in that direction for literary-critical models (see below). To what extent the presumed relevance of Mesopotamian models is justifiable remains to be discussed, but first let us see what Mesopotamian literary criticism has to offer.

Once cuneiform literature was deciphered in the latter half of the nineteenth century - the heyday of Biblical criticism - it was subjected to the same type of critical analysis being applied to Biblical literature. Although, with rare exceptions,[15] no one went so far as to identify the documentary sources of cuneiform literature by chapter and verse, conclusions similar to those of Biblical criticism were reached: many cuneiform literary compositions were also composite and the products of a long evolution. Not surprisingly, a leading exponent of this approach was Morris Jastrow, Jr., who was active in Biblical as well as cuneiform studies;[16] his work will be cited frequently below as representative of the critical analysis of cuneiform literature.[17]

By the accident of discovery - since in its first decades Mesopotamian archaeology concentrated on northern Mesopotamia - the first large body of cuneiform literature which become known was from the late (seventh century) libraries of Assyria, so that, as in the case of Biblical literature, it was the latest versions which were subjected to critical analysis. But unlike Biblical literature, cuneiform literature was generally written on imperishable material,[18] so that it was always possible that earlier forms of this literature would someday become available, thus enabling literary criticism to be based on documentary evidence rather than speculative critical analysis. And this is precisely what has happened. Copies of cuneiform compositions dating sometimes from almost two millenia earlier have come to light,[19] and we now have in the case of some compositions versions dating from several intervals over a span of nearly two thousand years. One of the first compositions to be investigated carefully on the basis of this evidence, the Gilgamesh Epic,[20] was characterized by S. N. Kramer, the author of the study, as presenting

> the earliest example of literary evolution known to man, and...in spite of the high antiquity of the material, it is based on direct and concrete evidence, and does not involve complicated hypotheses and tenuous assumptions.[21]

The Gilgamesh Epic is by no means unique in this respect, for many other cuneiform compositions are amenable to evolutionary study of this type. Whoever wishes to study the history of a cuneiform composition often has at his disposal not only the final product he is investigating, but also earlier recensions and even individual episodes and motifs in the forms in which they existed before the composition as a whole was created. Here, in sum, is a laboratory in which the Biblical scholar may discover what can be learned about literary evolution in a field where, unlike his own, conditions are so favorable for empirical investigation.

The present "literary-critical studies in the Gilgamesh Epic" represent the beginning of such an investigation, based on a small part of a single but exemplary composition. To those studies we now preface a survey, which makes no attempt to be exhaustive, of some of the resources cuneiform literature offers for answering the Biblical critic's questions.

B. Materials for recensional history

Let us begin with compositions whose evolution is attested by a number of recensions spread over several centuries. Examples from various genres may be cited.

"The Descent of Ishtar/Inanna to the Nether World" exists in at least two Sumerian and at least three Akkadian recensions.[22] Kramer compared the Sumerian and Akkadian versions and concluded that they agreed only in general outline while varying in details, style, and tone.[23] This conclusion was later to be repeated for Enuma Eliš and what Kramer believed to be its Sumerian prototypes[24] and for the Sumerian and Akkadian versions of the various Gilgamesh tales.[25] More recently Falkenstein studied the various recensions of the "Descent of Ishtar/Inanna"[26] and noted that the Sumerian versions themselves disagree on whether Dumuzi's consignment to the Nether World was deserved or not; the text of Dumuzi's plea to Utu differs in each version in accordance with its view on this question. Falkenstein suggested that the myth of Inanna's descent was created to account for Dumuzi's death, which remains unexplained in the older nature-myth which narrates it. Another composition, "The Myth of Anzu"[27] has a Sumerian forerunner and Old Babylonian and Assyrian recensions, and the identity of the hero varies among them.[28] "Etana" has Old Babylonian, Middle Assyrian, and Neo-Assyrian recensions.[29] The flood story exists in a Sumerian forerunner of the Atrahasis Epic, in the Old Babylonian and Neo-Assyrian recensions of the latter, in fragmentary Middle Babylonian texts from Nippur and Ras Shamra, in the eleventh tablet of the Gilgamesh Epic, and in Greek paraphrase in Berossus.[30] The version in Gilgamesh was compared by Laessøe with those parts of the Atrahasis version available at the time.[31] He noted various differences between the two, but concluded that the Atrahasis version was "a primary source on which an editor of Gilg. 11 depended."[32] Now that so much more of the Old Babylonian version of Atrahasis has been recovered it will be possible to compare the various recensions of this composition as a whole.[33] Laessøe observed that the Sumerian flood story may actually be a forerunner of the Atrahasis Epic as a whole,[34] and more recently T. Frymer has studied several Sumerian texts and motifs which appear to be forerunners of the first tablet of Atrahasis.[35] Another epic composition whose evolution has been illuminated recently is the "Naram-Sin Legend,"[36] Following Gurney's edition of the Neo-Assyrian fragments[37] Finkelstein re-examined the epic's Old Babylonian precursor[38] and concluded that while certain points of similarity unmistakably showed the two texts to be related, the differences were so great that the older text could not be regarded as the Old Babylonian version of the younger. It was rather to

> be conjectured that there was in circulation by the Old Babylonian period a series of more or less legendary episodes about the misfortunes of Naram-Sin. These could be incorporated into different types of compositions which might otherwise be unrelated, much as identical material about Sargon is found both in the chronicles and in omen texts. Column III of the Morgan fragment [the Old Babylonian precursor of the Naram-Sin Legend] and lines 85-93 of the Assyrian legend could conceivably represent just such an episode.[39]

While column iii of the Morgan fragment and lines 85-93 of the later legend "must derive ultimately from some single source,"[40] Finkelstein's remarks imply that the Morgan fragment is an uncle rather than an ancestor of the later legend. Other questions, such as the scope of the composition to which the Morgan fragment belonged, remain unanswerable.

In the genre of divine hymns we have the Nisaba hymn "Oh Lady colored like the stars of heaven" (nin mul-an-gim dar-a),[41] on a stone tablet from Lagash from about the time of Gudea (latter half of the 22nd century), four Ur tablets, two of them bilingual, from about three hundred years later, and a Yale prism (perhaps from the time of Samsuiluna [1749-1712], but recensionally closer to the Lagash tablet than the Ur texts are); Hallo compared the Lagash and later versions and pointed out a number of modifications in the latter of theological and cultic significance as well as simply orthographic. In the course of this study he noted that its stone medium marks the Lagash tablet as monumental in nature, intended as a dedicatory inscription or the like, and he suggested that the divine hymns in general, like some other genres, originated in monumental form.[42] In an earlier study Hallo traced private individual prayer from early monumental form in votive objects and inscriptions, through Neo-Sumerian letter-prayers (OB period), then a Middle Babylonian transitional phase, and finally the penitential psalms (*eršahunga*s) of the first millennium; in the course of this study he noted changes in form and content as well as *Sitz im Leben*.[43] For the genre of congregational laments R. Kutscher has recently studied the recensional history of the Sumerian lamentation "Oh Angry Sea" (a-ab-ba ḫu-luḫ-ḫa).[44] In addition to tracing various developments in length, structure, mood, and *Sitz im Leben* (the latter established for some periods on the basis of entries in liturgical calendars) from the Old Babylonian to the Seleucid periods, Kutscher suggests that in its original form the composition was devoid of specific references to events and cities, so that it could be used without modification at any temple demolition and rebuilding ceremony in any city, and that in later recensions it was adapted for different cities and used in the worship of their respective gods. A similar use of a šu-íl-lá prayer has been demonstrated by J. S. Cooper.[45]

XUM

Comparing five Neo-Assyrian and Neo-Babylonian manuscripts of one hymn originally composed for Marduk, he shows that in the Nimrud manuscript the hymn was adapted for Nabu by inserting additional references to that god and his city Borsippa, with the original parts of the hymn remaining unaltered, while in a fragment from Aššur the hymn was apparently adapted for that city's god not by the *addition* of *new* references, but by *substituting* references to Aššur and his cult for the original references to Marduk and his cult. On the basis of ritual calendar references Cooper shows that hymns could even be adopted for different gods outright, with no modification at all.[46] The same phenomenon of adaptability is attested in mythological literature in the well-known substitution of the god Aššur for Marduk in some parts of the Aššur version of Enuma Elish,[47] and in the varying identity of the hero in the different recensions of "The Myth of Anzu," as noted above.

For the genre of incantations Oppenheim discovered an example of redactorial creativity in "A New Prayer to the Gods of the Night."[48] In comparing several versions of a standard invocation he found that the redactor of one version had lent it a new, personal meaning by shifting the order of the standard structural elements, changing one key sentence, and introducing several new elements in order to accomodate the changes he had made.

From the field of wisdom literature Lambert has compared the "three very diverse recensions" of "The Tamarisk and the Palm," Old Babylonian, Middle Assyrian, and early Neo-Assyrian. He has noted that certain sections are variously present or lacking in each, that certain corresponding sections are dissimilar to each other, while others correspond closely.[49]

In the genre of royal annals, several recensions of the same king's annals are frequently available; Tadmor has been active in comparing recensions and accounting, where possible [illegible] for sometimes significant differences.[50]

Omen literature provides us with examples of extremely complex recensional histories. The astrological series Enuma Anu Enlil is represented in one Old Babylonian text, several texts from the middle and late second-millennium, and numerous Neo-Assyrian and Neo- and Late Babylonian texts.[51] In the introduction to The Omen Series Šumma Izbu[52] E. Leichty notes indications of a pre-Old Babylonian, possibly oral, tradition of birth omens, Old Babylonian forerunners to the canonical version, canonical texts from Aššur, Babylon, Borsippa, Nineveh, Nimrud, and Uruk ranging from roughly 1100-100, and non-canonical texts in Akkadian, Hittite, Hurrian, and Ugaritic from Boghazköy, Ras Shamra, Sultantepe, and Susa ranging from c. 1450 to beyond 600. The distribution of the material enabled Leichty to offer suggestions as to how the earliest material was expanded, how the fuller tradition was organized and crystallized first into two separate series and finally further expanded by the addition of a third section.

Similarly complex is the recensional history of the lexical texts.[53] To cite only the most recently published example, the history of the series lú = *ša*[54] includes "Early Dynastic LÚ-Lists," "Old Babylonian Proto-LÚ," "Peripheral and Secondary Versions of Proto-LÚ," "The Canonical Series LÚ = *ša*," "The Old Babylonian LÚ-Series," as well as "Miscellaneous LÚ-Lists."[55]

C. *Evidence of compositeness*

In addition to offering such materials for the study of recensional history, cuneiform literature often permits identification of once-independent sources and traditions which are combined in the final product. There may be some evidence in scribal terminology and in colophons for the composite nature of certain cuneiform compositions. Two of the terms used for composing literature are Sumerian KA-kešda and the synonymous Akkadian *kaṣāru*, literally "tie, join, gather" - in connection with a work of literature, "compose."[56] The English "compose" means etymologically the same thing, as do Hebrew *ḥabber*[57] and Arabic *'allafa*,[58] which are likewise used for composing works of literature. The fact that *rhap-* in Greek *rhapsode* may mean "stitch" (the rhapsodist being one who stitches epic songs together) has been invoked in the discussion of the compositeness of the Homeric epics.[59] The question which interests us here is whether in the cuneiform texts it is distinct literary elements (episodes and the like) whose "gathering together" is referred to by these terms, or rather simply words and phrases,[60] or literary cliches. Sumerian KA-kešda might be considered evidence for the latter possibilities, since the element KA can mean "mouth" (read ka) or "word" (read inim), so that the term may mean "bind in the mouth" or "bind words;" but since the KA appears in KA-kešda even in meanings which have no conceivable oral aspect, such as gathering troops and tying knots,[61] no semantic significance can be attributed to it. The meaning "bind words" or "bind (with) words" does appear in Sumerian inim-KA-kešda, but the meaning of this complex is restricted to contracts and promises, and the Akkadian equivalent of its verbal element is *rakāsu* rather than *kaṣāru*.[62] That the gathering referred to in the scribal terminology applies rather to literary units or the like is shown by the fact that in two of the four attested occurrences of the cuneiform terms the direct object of the verb is a word for tablet: Sargon's daughter Enḫeduanna describes herself as the lú-dub-KA-kéš-da, "compiler of the tablet(s?)," of the collection of forty-two Sumerian temple hymns (in the next line she speaks of "giving birth" to it) - a composition which is clearly composite even though some unity may have been lent to it in the process of redaction;[63] at the end of the Erra Epic, Kabti-ilāni-Marduk, son of Dabibi, describes himself as *kāṣir kammēšu*, "compiler of its (or of his [Erra's]) tablet(s?)."[64] The other two occurrences of these terms are: Gudea's reference to èn-du-KA-kéš-du-mu, "my compiled (collection of) songs"[65] - the context makes it clear that the compilation is a written one (though it does not rule out its having originally been composed orally); and the reference to the (astronomical) series u_4-SAR-an-^{d}en-lil-la[66] *ša ikṣuru Adap[a]*, "which Adapa composed."[67] On the whole this usage resembles that of *ḫibber* in medieval Hebrew literature, where it is the component elements (laws, teachings, exegetical comments, explanations, and the like) which are said to be compiled into the compositions (*ḫibburim*) in question; however, the more general meaning "to author" seems sometimes apparent in the Hebrew usages, so that if one is to argue from analogy, this aspect will have to be kept in mind.

Evidence of compositeness may also be implied in certain colophons which state that the texts which they accompany are based on more than one original, although the subject is moot enough to call for caution. The most important text relating to this subject is the much discussed Nazimarrutaš (1323-1298) colophon in *KAR* 177: Obv. IV, 25 ff.[68] *KAR* 177 is a "Sammeltafel" - itself a type of composite text; it contains in its eight columns hemerologies copied from a number of smaller tablets, including the original colophons of the latter. The colophon following one section reads:

IV,25. UD.MEŠ DÙG.GA.MEŠ[69] KA 7 *a[p?-kal?-li?]*	Propitious days according to the seven *a[pkallus]*;
26. GABA.RI *Sippar*^{KI} *Nippur*^{KI}	Original(s) of Sippar, Nippur,
27. *Babili*^{KI} *Larsa*^{KI}	Babylon, Larsa,
28. *Uri*^{KI} *Uruk*^{KI} *u* *Eri*$_4$-*du*$_{10}$^{KI}	Ur, Uruk, and Eridu;
29. *um-ma-a-ni ú-na-as-si-ḫu-ma*	The scholars excerpted and
30. *ú-na-as-si-qu-ma*	selected and
31. *a-na* ^{I}*Na-zi-múru-u[t-ta]š*	gave to Nazimarrutaš,
32. *šàr kiššati iddinu*	King of the world.
.....	.....

Von Soden took this colophon to indicate the preparation of a canonical text incorporating the best readings of seven exemplars. He construed the verbs *nasāḫu* and *nasāqu* to govern the "originals" listed in ll. 26-28 so that it was these originals which were subjected to excerpting and selection. A verb like *nasāqu*, meaning "select," does indeed seem to imply a weighing of variants; *nasāḫu*, "excerpt,"[70] can, conformably, refer to copying out the preferred variant into the new canonical version. Here, too, we cannot tell what precisely is being selected and excerpted -single words, whole sentences, or full sections. We know that mantic literature distinguished between what was canonical (*damqu*, "good;"[71] *ša iškari*, "belonging to the series"[72]) and non-canonical (*aḫû*, "external, additional;"[73] *la ša iškari*, "not belonging to the series"[74]), and that these designations applied to both single lines and full tablets.[75] Scribal activity clearly involved decisions about individual words as well.[76] Hunger imagines the colophon's seven originals to have all covered the same material, the seven being consulted for such purposes as restoring lacunae.

Lambert subsequently challenged von Soden's interpretation of the colophon by noting that it would be anomalous for the verbs nasāḫu and nasāqu to be syntactically related to the "originals" of ll. 26-28, since lists of originals in other colophons are never connected syntactically with the rest of the colophon. While this observation is not necessarily harmful to von Soden's view, it does open up the possibility, suggested by Lambert, that the process of excerpting and selecting refers not to canonical activity which produced the final text, but to the process by which the original text - a digest of propitious days (for royal consultation) - was created. As for the seven originals, Lambert's suggestion is a bit unclear, but he seems to argue as follows: Citation of several originals from different cities refers elsewhere to links in a manuscript tradition: manuscript A was copied from manuscript B which was copied from manuscript C, and so forth. The seven originals of our colophon are a way to trace the text back to the seven antediluvian sages (apkallus):[77] since each lived in a different city, the only way the text can be credited to all of them is to credit each with a part - thus the seven originals. This seems to imply a composite text incorporating seven sources. But since Lambert invokes the notion of the manuscripts following upon each other, a chronological sequence is implied, so that we should have to imagine each sage adding to what his predecessor had written, until the final, much expanded, version was produced by the last antediluvian sage; in other words, growth by accretion. Since the antediluvian sages were supposed by the later traditions to have lived at different times[78] such a chronological sequence seems preferable. Since the first sage, Adapa, is associated with Eridu[79] (as is the first antediluvian king[80]), and since in one tradition Sippar is the home of the last antediluvian sage[81] and the site where the sages' teachings were buried for safekeeping just before the flood,[82] the cities of the seven originals in our colophon may be listed in reverse chronological order so that the final version of our text was thought to have been composed in Sippar (and recovered there after the flood).

More recently Hunger has challenged Lambert's sequential view by noting that (1) citation of several originals from several cities refers to a chronological sequence only when it is explicitly stated that each was copied from its predecessor; numerous examples show that "copied from A which was copied from B" was a standard formula, attested at Assur as well as Nineveh, so that when, as in *KAR* 177, the formula is absent, chronological sequence may be presumed not to be intended; (2) comparable to our list of seven originals are statements in other colophons such as *kī pī 2 ṭuppāni labirūti šatir*, "written according to two old(er) tablets," which cannot be construed to refer to a chronological sequence but must refer to "contemporary" tablets; the same, Hunger argues, must be concluded for lists of tablets stemming from several cities. On the basis of these points Hunger returns to von Soden's theory of canonical activity.

For the present we must leave the question open, but we may conclude by referring to an observation made by S. Talmon[83] that textual and redactorial activity (of the types supposed by von Soden-Hunger and Lambert) are not necessarily different in principle: each involves the sifting of variants, at times the dropping of one in favor of the other, and at other times retention of both; whether the activity is done on a single reading, a sentence or an entire literary unit, the activity remains in essence the same. Finally it should be noted that even if the seven originals of the Nazimarrutaš colophon are fictional (as suggested by Lambert), the colophon undoubtedly reflects real scribal practices.

One of the best-known cases of a literary composition which combined once distinct elements is the Gilgamesh

Epic, which will be discussed in detail below, Ch. I-VI. A much earlier example, which permits us to speak of specific documentary sources rather than simply "elements" or "traditions," is the Sumerian King List. Th. Jacobsen showed that the section listing the antediluvian kings was a later addition to the list, which originally began with the post-diluvian section. He demonstrated this on the basis not only of internal stylistic (formulaic and grammatical) differences between the two sections (which harmonists might explain as purposeful), but also on the basis of the existence of copies of the list which omitted the antediluvian section, and the existence of independent copies of the antediluvian section. In addition to noting the stylistic differences, which show that the scribe who first incorporated the antediluvian section did not wholly adapt it to the post-diluvian section's style, Jacobsen pointed to several other details where some adaptation did take place.[84] The antediluvian section itself was examined by Finkelstein, who compared the various King List manuscripts as well as the later versions quoted by Berossus.[85] He noted that while the various witnesses are relatively unanimous regarding the names, and sequence of the cities,[86] there is less unanimity on the number, names, and sequence of kings, and wide divergence on the length of their reigns and the total length of the antediluvian period.

What could be one of the most fascinating cases of the joining of independent literary compositions involves a Neo-Assyrian version of the Atrahasis Epic.[87] A certain reconstructed Neo-Assyrian tablet from Nineveh (7th century), K4175 + Sm57 + 80-7-19,184 and 82-3-23,146,[88] like its older duplicate from Assur (late 12th or early 11th century), KAR 4, contains in its left-hand columns the so-called "Silbenalphabet" or "syllabic alphabet," a list of Sumerian syllables beginning with me-me pa_4-pa_4; while its right-hand columns contain a bilingual version of the creation of man.[89] The Nineveh tablet's colophon identifies the entire tablet as the second of the composition me-me [pa_4-p]a_4 i-li,[90] while the colophon of the Assur duplicate states at the end of the creation story that the composition is at an end (AL.TIL).[91] Now the Silbenalphabet is known as an independent composition in copies from as early as the Old Babylonian period.[92] We have, then, in the Neo-Assyrian texts a clear case of a new composition created by the joining of two originally independent compositions. Landsberger long ago suggested that this joining of a syllabary and a creation story may have involved a midrashic explanation of the syllables as the first utterances of human speech.[93] What is especially interesting, however, is what may be the next stage in the history of this composition. While in the Assur copy the text ends as the colophon states, with the creation story, the catchline at the end of the Nineveh copy indicates that in that edition the text was followed by another tablet (or tablets). The catchline of the reconstructed tablet was read e-nu-ma i-lu$_4$ a-[ ], which Gadd plausibly restored as e-nu-ma- i-lu$_4$ a-[we-lum],[94] the beginning of the Atrahasis Epic, which narrates the creation and history of mankind down through the flood. This identification is further supported by the results of a collation of the catchline recently undertaken by Sollberger at my request. He writes that "the a- of awilum and even the beginning of -wi- shows clearly on the fragment Sm 57."[95] From this colophon it has been concluded that "an edition of the Atrahasis Epic was available in the Nineveh Library" which consisted of (1) the Silbenalphabet, (2) the bilingual creation story, and (3) the Atrahasis Epic [96] -- three originally independent texts now combined into a single literary composition. However, plausible though this seems, a note of caution must be registered.[97] While catchlines certainly do refer to successive tablets of a single series,[98] they sometimes refer to successive series, the succession implying nothing more than proximity on a library "shelf" or in a school curriculum.[99] It has not been demonstrated that in the case of our texts the catchline serves the former rather than latter function.

Another case of juxtaposition of originally independent materials may be found in the Laws of Hammurapi. J. J. Finkelstein has recently suggested on the basis of some documentary evidence (admittedly not univocal) that "from an early date, perhaps contemporaneously with Hammurapi himself, the laws [of Hammurapi] circulated as a text without the prologue, which, in all likelihood, was originally an independent composition."[100] Finkelstein suggested, again with some documentary support, that "the 'prologue' [to the Laws of Hammurapi] was an adaptation of an already known Hammurapi hymn for the monumental purpose of the stela."[101] In an earlier study Finkelstein suggested "that the sources of the structural elements of this [the 'Law Code'] genre... were varied," and he called attention specifically to permanent economic reforms in the codes which may have been part of the *mīšarum* act at the beginning of the king's reign, and to hypothetical legal cases which were derived from the school curriculum[102] rather than real legal practice.[103] The latter study is also of significance for the form-criticism of the law corpora. In it Finkelstein tries to determine the *Sitz im Leben* and the sequence in a king's reign of the *mīšarum* act, the *mīšarum* text, and the law corpus, and to trace the development of these forms over a period of several centuries.[104]

The decipherment of Sumerian literature has permitted the tracing of the antecedents of several Akkadian compositions. Shortly before his major study of the Sumerian sources of the Gilgamesh Epic (see below, Ch. I,A) Kramer pointed out briefly the Sumerian roots of several motifs in Enuma Eliš, and pointed out new meanings lent to the old material by the Akkadian adaptors.[105] He summarized his conclusions as follows:

> In the Sumer of the last half of the third millennium B. C. there were current numerous creation myths; in the course of centuries that followed the contents of some of these myths were combined and modified by the Babylonian scribes to evolve a myth more in accordance with their own Semitic heritage and temper; the present text of Enuma eliš represents the culmination of this evolution.[106]

More recently some of these conclusions have been challenged by Jacobsen, who argues that the story of the battle between Marduk and Tiamat actually originated on the Mediterranean coast, where it is reflected in the Ugaritic myth of the battle between Baal and Yamm.[107] For our purposes it is important to note that this debate is conducted on a level different from that permitted by internal analysis alone; in the latter circumstance the alleged source is a hypothetical construct, while here each scholar can point to real texts which embody or reflect the source he alleges.

D. Intercultural literary borrowing

Whether Jacobsen's theory is correct or not, it brings us to the subject of literary borrowing between cultures. In preparing the following studies in the Gilgamesh Epic we have often been led to examine and compare material from the Hittite translation of the Epic. This has raised a more general question of possibly far reaching significance for comparative Biblical-Near Eastern studies:

In what form was cuneiform literature known in areas peripheral to Mesopotamia? When cuneiform literary compositions were known in Anatolia, Syria, Palestine, and Egypt, whether in the original tongues or in translation, how similar were these versions to those known from Mesopotamia itself? The importance of this question may be gauged by reference to some well-known cases of presumed literary borrowing. The famous carpe diem passage in Eccl. 9:7-9 has long been thought to have been influenced by Siduri's advice to Gilgamesh in the Old Babylonian Meissner fragment of Gilgamesh X, iii.[108] This view was challenged by R. Gordis, who pointed to classical and modern parallels as well as the Gilgamesh passage and the Egyptian "Song of the Harper,"[109] and concluded:

> It is obvious...that there can be no question of borrowing in so universally human a context, unless there were some unusual feature in common, or at least the same sequence of details. None of these factors obtains here. The Babylonian poet speaks of the joy of children, which is lacking in Koheleth, while the Egyptian poet lacks the reference to the love of woman found in the Hebrew sage. Virtually the only feature in common is the emphasis upon clean clothes (and even the fine oil mentioned is missing in the Babylonian poem). In addition, the long interval of time separating these poems from Koheleth rules out the possibility of borrowing, though it is quite conceivable that the theme was a conventionally popular one throughout the Orient.[110]

Gordis here adopts the criteria set out by Albright (for stories) several years earlier:

> Even when story motifs can be found in different contiguous lands, it is not safe to assume original relationship or borrowing except where the motif is complex, forming a pattern.[111]

The very same criteria were implicitly accepted by Speiser in arguing that the Ecclesiastes passage was indeed borrowed from Gilgamesh:

> ...the proof that the Biblical passage must be literarily (even if not directly) dependent on the Babylonian one is the identical order in which the ideas are presented.[112]

However one may evaluate Gordis' and Speiser's respective estimates of the evidence, it is clear that both agree with Albright on the importance of the complexity of a parallel and of a pattern. The same principle has been invoked in favor of another widely accepted parallel, that between the Priestly creation story in Genesis 1:1-2:4a and Enuma Elish. Heidel[113] and Speiser[114] pointed to eight points of contact between the two narratives (each noted differences as well) and stressed especially their identical order in each. But in the year following the appearance of Speiser's commentary, W. G. Lambert denied the relevance of some points of contact and concluded that "The differences [between Biblical and Mesopotamian accounts of origins in Gen. 1-11] are indeed so great that direct borrowing of a literary form of Mesopotamian traditions is out of the question," and concluded that what borrowing did take place probably occurred during the Amarna age and reached the Hebrews in oral form; the bearers of the traditions may have been the Hurrians.[115] Shortly thereafter Weinfeld argued that "there exist many differences between Babylonian myth and

Genesis 1 which are difficult to explain if we assume direct borrowing from Babylonian material"[116] (a point substantially admitted even by earlier advocates of a relationship) and expressed his approval of S. Hermann's argument in favor of Egyptian inspiration for Gen. 1, citing especially the detailed similarity of a cosmogonic passage in "The Instruction for King Meri-ka-Re."[117] Here again we find several scholars implicitly accepting the criteria of complexity, or detailed correspondence, and pattern; even those whose case does not satisfy those criteria concede that their failure to do so prevents a precise explanation of the relationship between the parallels.

Quite obviously, however, in the case of both examples, advocates of these comparisons, including those who accepted Albright's criteria, were prepared to accomodate some differences in details, feeling that these differences were not significant enough to damage their cases.[118] The principle is thus not absolute. How much divergence one may allow between materials which are allegedly related is obviously a subjective matter. The question I wish to raise here is whether we can find any guidance in this matter from the Mesopotamian literature which we have in copies and translations from peripheral areas. How much do the peripheral versions resemble the native Mesopotamian versions to which they are indisputably related? Much material from the peripheral areas is now available for comparison with Mesopotamian originals. For the Gilgamesh Epic we have Akkadian texts from Boghazköy[119] and, of special significance for biblists, from Megiddo,[120] as well as Hittite and Hurrian translations.[121] Numerous other compositions are also found in peripheral copies or translations, of which we shall mention only a few of literary character. At least one Hittite fragment of Atrahasis has recently been discovered.[122] A prayer to Ishtar is now known in a Neo-Babylonian copy, a fifteen-line fragment from Nineveh, an Akkadian version from Boghazköy, and a Hittite translation from the same site;[123] some trilingual versions of Mesopotamian literary works, with versions from peripheral sites are known as well.[124] Recent finds from Ras Shamra include a fragment of the flood story.[125] From Tell-el-Amarna in Egypt we have a version of the myth "Nergal and Ereshkigal," now known also in a Neo-Assyrian recension from Sultantepe.[126] "The Myth of Anzu" is known in copies from Susa as well as Assur, Nineveh, and Sultantepe, with a Sumerian forerunner from Ur.[127] "Etana" likewise is known from Susa as well as Assyria.[128]

Several of these peripheral versions have been found to differ markedly from their native Mesopotamian counterparts. For example, Gurney had this to say about the relationship between the Sultantepe and Amarna versions of

"Nergal and Ereshkigal:"

> The essential outlines of this story are already present in the Amarna version, but whereas the latter presents a bald, concise narrative of hardly more than a hundred lines, the Assyrian version is a literary composition enlivened by much incidental conversation and containing passages borrowed from other works; moreover, the whole of Nergal's first journey to the Underworld and his return to heaven are found only in the later [i.e. Sultantepe] text. Yet we cannot be sure that these additions are of late origin. Most Assyrian manuscripts of such poems are in the direct line of descent from Old Babylonian originals, and the Amarna tablet may well represent an abbreviated local version, like that of the Gilgamesh Epic found at Boğazköy.[129]

Lambert went even further in his assessment of the differences between the two recensions and concluded that the Amarna version

> is so completely different from the traditional Mesopotamian one as to give the impression that oral tradition alone will explain it.[130]

The Hittite version of the Gilgamesh Epic, as Gurney noted, is far shorter than the Mesopotamian versions - its first tablet covers the material narrated in the first five tablets of the Neo-Assyrian version.[131] It abbreviates some episodes and omits others entirely, including those which involve descriptions of Uruk and were of little interest to an Anatolian audience.[132] The journey to the Cedar Mountain and the battle with Huwawa receives a great deal more attention presumably because its locale was close to Anatolia and the events provoked interest on the part of Anatolian listeners.[133] Otten has pointed to one of the variants reflecting Anatolian religious ideology.[134]

The Hurrian recension from Boghazköi actually entitled one of its tablets "Huwawa" rather than "Gilgamesh" (as it entitled another).[135] In Ch. II, below, we will have occasion to compare the Old Babylonian, Hittite, and Neo-Assyrian recensions' descriptions of Enkidu before he became civilized. There we will note that the Hittite version says nothing of Enkidu's hairiness and clothing, or lack of it, and that it adds that the wild animals "raised" him, which is missing in the corresponding section of the Neo-Assyrian recension (but found in the latter's VII,i,3f.); it shares with the Neo-Assyrian version only the statement that Enkidu lived in the steppe and grazed and watered with the animals, but it terms the latter "wild animals" instead of "gazelles." Now no one will deny that these descriptions are ultimately related, since they are each other's counterparts in two versions of the same composition. But if we were to apply the exacting criteria exemplified in Gordis' argument against borrowing in Ecclesiastes, we might have to conclude that the similarities between the Hittite and Neo-Assyrian versions of Enkidu's early life are not great enough to support a case for a relationship between them! It will do no good to object that the comparison of the Hittite and Neo-Assyrian recensions is invalid since the Hittite recension may reflect an earlier and divergent Mesopotamian recension.[136] We have no control over which recensions of a composition reach foreign territory. The fact is simply that the Hittites had a version which differed from the canonical Neo-Assyrian version, and these are the versions which are available for comparison. To state that the Hittite version differs because it stems from a different recension is simply to explain the difference, not to render it irrelevant for our argument.

The great difference which can exist between two versions of the same text has unsettling implications. It means that an alleged relationship between a Biblical text, or motif, and a Mesopotamian one (or any other ancient Near Eastern one, for that matter), cannot be refuted simply by pointing to differences between the two. How, then, can such allegations be examined critically? We will have to consider degrees of probability: clearly, the fewer such differences, the more plausible the allegation will seem. We will also have to consider circumstantial criteria, such as the likelihood of a given author being familiar with motifs or literature stemming from a certain foreign provenance - in other words, with the question of "channels of transmission."[137] Another circumstantial criterion would be the number of parallels from the same source found in the same author or in the same period. The latter seems applicable to Eccl. 9:7-9, for Ecclesiastes contains another parallel to the Gilgamesh Epic, Eccl. 4:9-12,[138] while another book from the same--post-exilic--period contains yet another parallel to the epic, Dan. 4:30.[139] These parallels suggest that the Gilgamesh

Epic may have been known in the Palestinian area during the post-exilic period. In discussing the first of the Ecclesiastes passages Ginsberg expressed a suspicion that Koheleth may have seen an Aramaic version of the advice of Siduri.[140] The likelihood of both this suggestion and that of knowledge of Gilgamesh in Palestine during the post-exilic period is enhanced when one considers that another composition of likely Mesopotamian origin,[141] the Tale of Aḥiqar, made its way, in Aramaic, as far west as Egypt by the Persian period.[142] To the extent that one can gather circumstantial evidence of this sort in support of alleged literary parallels one will have greater confidence in making the allegations. But neither the absence of such evidence nor differences between a Biblical passage and its alleged antecedent or source will by themselves constitute a strong argument against the allegation.

E. Previous statements on our subject

Scholars have not failed to note how studies of cuneiform literary history may provide insights into the development of Biblical literature. As has often been the case, one of the first to suggest this was W. F. Albright. As early as 1940, in From the Stone Age to Christianity,[143] Albright made some general remarks on this approach in the section on "The Transmission of Written Documents" in the chapter entitled "New Horizons in History,"[144] and offered observations in four areas:[145]

1. Gattungsgeschichte, or the categories of literary style. The anonymity and stereotypicality observable in Biblical literature are paralleled to an even greater extent in Egyptian and cuneiform literature.[146] There stereotypicality so predominates over individual traits - in other words, authors use traditional, not personal styles[147] - as to "give sufficient warning against using canons of style and vocabulary too rigidly in trying to determine authorship of passages in the Old Testament." Originality was not totally lacking, however.[148]

2. Literary forgery. "There is hardly any evidence at all in the ancient Near East for documentary or literary fabrications," so that the likelihood of "pious fraud" in Biblical literature appears to have been exaggerated on the basis of analogy from the classical world.

3. Textual revision. Scribes generally updated the spelling and grammar of older texts[149] (sometimes [incompetent] archaizing also took place, which we now know to have been true of Biblical literature as well. "...scholars have frequently come to grief in trying to take the present Hebrew text as reflecting the orthography of its prototype."[150]

4. Analysis of sources. "The tendency of ancient Oriental scribes and compilers to add rather than to subtract"[151] -

in other words, the fact that literature tends to become expanded by additions, including variants, commentaries, and glosses - "has a direct bearing on such questions as the method" followed in the compilation of the Pentateuch. It implies that whatever divergences we find between J and E represent all the variants that existed: if there were other variants they would not have been subtracted.[152] The process of growth by addition also implies "that much of the expansion evident in legal and liturgic passages is not due to literary doublets but to the normal swelling of the text by the accretion of commentaries or of subsequent court decisions, etc."[153]

About a decade later C. H. Gordon suggested some implications of ancient Near Eastern, especially Ugaritic, literature for Biblical criticism. He argued that since Ugaritic literature evidences the use of several names for the same character in one and the same text, "The criterion of variant names (specifically for God) as an indication for differences of authorship must be drastically discounted...in the light of Ugarit"[154] (he later added Greek evidence as well).[155] He further argued that differences in style in the same composition can also be found in Ugaritic and Akkadian sources, so that, too, cannot be a criterion of disparate authorship. These changes are rather due to changes of topic.

> No one denies that diverse antecedents make up any literary composition; but the rediscovery of the

> lost literatures of the Bible World shows us that most Biblical books could be accepted in Israel as single compositions, in much the same way as the Gilgamesh Epic, with all its stylistic diversity, was in Mesopotamia. The importance of clarifying this subject warrants another clear-cut example: No one questions that Hammurabi's Code is a single composition [note now, however, the view of Finkelstein cited above] in spite of the fact that the prologue and epilogue are not only written in poetry (as against the prose of the laws) but in a different dialect from the laws, because the poetry calls not only for different style but even for different grammatical forms.[156]

Gordon also noted the relevance of this material for the structure of the book of Job:

> The ABA pattern of Hammurabi's Code (whereby the prologue and epilogue are poetry; but the laws, in between, are prose) must be borne in mind when we deal with the book of Job. Job, too, follows the ABA pattern; though, since the main part of the book is poetry, the prologue and epilogue are prose. Stylistically, then, the prologue and epilogue are part of the original book of Job, precisely as the prologue and epilogue of the Code are part of Hammurabi's original stela. To separate the prose from the poetic parts by centuries is as unjustified in the one case as in the other, as far as literary form is concerned.[157]

Gordon concluded:

> The magnificent structure of Old Testament higher criticism is not to be brushed aside; but its individual results can no longer be accepted unless they square with the Hebrew text as we can now understand it in the light of parallel literatures from the pagan forerunners and contemporaries of the Hebrews, in the Bible Lands.[158]

In the following years Albright reached similar conclusions on the inadmissability of composite language as evidence of composite authorship,[159] and then took up the question of the growth in length of the various literary genres:

> Following the analogies of [Mesopotamia and Egypt], as well as of Asia Minor and Greece, we should expect to have long compositions as well as short at any given period. We should, accordingly, reject the evolutionary strait jacket imposed on early literatures by H. Gunkel and some of his successors, according to which short compositions are generally earlier than long compositions in the same category.[160]

In 1957 G. E. Mendenhall, in discussing the reliability of the Pentateuchal sources as historical documents pointed out that evaluation of the sources' historical worth had heretofore been largely hypothetical:

> The value of literary analysis for history and its success in convincing the scholarly world today depend upon the isolation of more adequate criteria for judgement than has evidently so far been produced by its adherents. The results, consequently, must be judged to fall in the category of hypothesis, not of historical fact. For the reconstruction of history itself, something more than literary analysis is needed, valuable and necessary as hypotheses are.[161]

As one possible source of criteria for evaluating the historical accuracy of written traditions Mendenhall suggested the study of cuneiform literary history:

> Since some religious traditions of the ancient world can be traced over periods of many centuries, we can see how the ancient scribe conceived of his task; we can at least have preliminary insights into the circumstances under which changes in the religious (or legal) traditions took place. Even here we cannot mechanically transfer into Israel all the characteristics of the Babylonian scribe, but we shall at least have some comparable material which would be far more adequate than that on which 19th-century assumptions were based...[162]

A few years later, in another discussion of the historical reliability of the Pentateuch,[163] M. Greenberg raised a fundamental question about some of the very suppositions of source analysis. Two of these suppositions are:

> that an interruption of chronological order or a mixture of styles indicates composition - resting on the assumption that original creations in biblical times were chronologically ordered and stylistically homogeneous.
>
> that composition implies lateness...

Greenberg called for tapping

> the materials of ancient near Eastern literature... by tradition and form criticism...a study of their literary styles and habits, especially with an eye to the differences between our expectations and their performance, would put solid ground under the feet of the man who would speak confidently about what may and may not be expected in a piece of ancient near Eastern literature...until we have solid studies of the styles of ancient near Eastern writing, how can we speak with confidence about what is in and out of order, an editorial excrescence or an original "awkwardness" - from our viewpoint - in biblical writing? Not, mind you, that one has any right automatically to equate biblical style with extrabiblical. But if the evidence goes the way I suspect it will, the same sort of verisimilitude that Mari, Nuzi, and Hammurabi have given the customs of patriarchal times is likely to be lent to the present styles of biblical writing, changing our conception of the editor's hand in creating them.[164]

The recurrent theme of these comments has been the hypothetical nature of Biblical literary criticism. This was the starting point of a study by Hallo in 1962 in which he offered the "comparative method" as the

> one approach which seems to offer some prospect of objective, verifiable data against which to test biblical hypotheses...In the area of literary techniques, the evidence from the literate neighbors of ancient Israel is not only relevant to the Biblical problems, but also enjoys a scholarly consensus based on a maximum of facts and a minimum of theories.[165]
>
> The possibility presents itself of tracing the growth of a Mesopotamian literary composition

> through two millenia, from its first written fixation, through its creative adaptation to new forms and even new languages, to its final, orderly incorporation into an official canon. Without this basic knowledge, all higher literary criticism remains hopelessly hypothetical. With it, the foundations are laid for a comparative approach to biblical criticism.[166]

The approach suggested by these scholars was taken up by K. A. Kitchen in a study which showed that the approach might yield conclusions which are unfavorable to current Biblical theories.[167] Besides seconding Albright's strictures upon the form-critical view that compositions always evolve from shorter to longer entities,[168] he sought to refute the basic criteria of source analysis by showing that they would lead to absurd conclusions if applied to other ancient Near Eastern compositions which have known histories.[169]

> ...the documentary theory in its many variations has throughout been elaborated in a vacuum without any proper reference to other Ancient Oriental literatures to find out whether they had been created in this singular manner. ...[Failure to compare these literatures] is a most serious omission, because - in the forms actually preserved to us in the extant Old Testament - Hebrew literature shows very close external stylistic similarities to the other Ancient Oriental literatures among which (and as part of which) it grew up. Now, nowhere in the Ancient Orient is there anything which is definitely known to parallel the elaborate history of fragmentary composition and conflation of Hebrew literature (or marked by just such criteria) as the documentary hypotheses would postulate. And conversely, any attempt to apply the criteria of the documentary theorists to Ancient Oriental compositions that have known histories but exhibit the same literary phenomena results in manifest absurdities.[170]

This is not the place to ask whether all of Kitchen's arguments against the documentary hypothesis are convincing. Since Kitchen is one of the first, if not the first, to have undertaken to employ comparative material on literary composition in some detail, what interests us here is whether his methods in employing it are sound. One assumption in particular seems mistaken. Kitchen implies that since the alleged method of composition of Biblical literature cannot be paralleled elsewhere in the ancient Near East, this constitutes an argument against its having been employed in Israel either. This implication violates Mendenhall's caveat against mechanically transferring "into Israel all the characteristics of the Babylonian scribe." The absence of a technique elsewhere in the ancient Near East may make the assumed Israelite technique seem anomalous, but Israelite literature is unique in several other respects, too. If the documentary hypothesis seems convincing on other grounds (Kitchen denies this), then its uniqueness would call for explanation rather than denial. The emerging availability of comparative data has not ipso facto made critical analysis passé or invalidated its conclusions: what is anomalous is not by that very fact refuted.[171]

The virtue of Kitchen's study lies in the fact that it goes beyond the stage of programmatic suggestions and compares specific ancient Near Eastern documents. But his use of ancient Near Eastern materials seems too superficial to be decisive. What he means by "compositions that have known histories" usually refers to "monumental... texts that had no prehistory of hands and redactors,"[172] The assertion of "no prehistory" begs the question. At least in the cuneiform sphere the fact that a text is monumental does not mean it had no prehistory in the sense of drawing upon materials from different sources. This is in fact implicitly recognized by Kitchen in a different section of the chapter we are surveying. In commenting on the possible growth of the Hammurapi law corpus by accretion he notes that

> "[Hammurapi's] laws are known from a monument of his own time in his own name; therefore, any accretions of laws in his collection occurred before his work. Furthermore, there are apparent contradictions or discrepancies in the Hammurapi 'code' that are 'no less glaring than those which serve as the basis of analysing strata in the Bible.' These obviously have no bearing on the historical fact of Hammurapi having incorporated them in his collection."[173]

Kitchen fails to realize that his remarks also imply that the fact of a text's being the monument of a single individual does not prevent that text from having incorporated materials of diverse origin.

The methodological flaw in Kitchen's study, then, is that in invoking supposedly comparable ancient Near Eastern materials he fails to take account of the literary criticism of those materials. That is the sine qua non of this type of comparative study, as recognized in several of the programmatic statements quoted above. The present dissertation is intended as one study which satisfies that sine qua non.

F. The direction of future research

At this early stage in the comparative investigation of Biblical and ancient Near Eastern literary evolution the starting point of investigation should be the cuneiform material, not the Biblical. Kitchen's study shows that when one takes the latter as a starting point there may be a tendency to simply cast about for apparent parallels which will confirm preconceived hypotheses (in Kitchen's case, negative hypotheses), thus utilizing the ancient Near Eastern material in the most superficial way. When this is done, there is no likelihood that the ancient Near Eastern material will make us aware of new possibilities. At the present time the task of research is to gain a thorough understanding of literary evolution in those areas of the ancient Near East where documentary evidence is available on a large scale, primarily Mesopotamia. We will need studies of the literary history of several compositions before we can begin to create a typology of literary evolution. Detailed application of the results of the present study to Biblical criticism would therefore be premature.

However, some studies of this type have already been published, giving us an idea of the sorts of comparison which will become possible. At the very least these studies can overturn certain *a priori* assumptions (as illustrated by some of the comments of Gordon, Albright, and Kitchen referred to above - I mean to take no position here on the ultimate correctness of their views) or, on the other hand, show that certain types of literary development presumed by Biblical criticism, did take place in the ancient Near East.

An outstanding example of documentary composition is represented in the combination - if that it is - of the Silbenalphabet, the bilingual creation story, and the Atrahasis Epic. The fact that this text includes two separate creation stories, one after the other, in its narration of the primeval history of mankind, immediately calls to mind the place of Genesis 1:1-2:4a and 2:4b-24 in the Biblical primeval history. Like the Biblical stories, these two Mesopotamian stories differ from each other on a number of points:[174] unlike Atrahasis (I,i, 1ff.), in *KAR* 4 the gods' primordial labor is merely implicit in the text and is not viewed as oppressive; the bilingual account adds Shamash (1.7) to the triumvirate of Anu, Enlil, and Ea, who are involved in the decision to create man in Atrahasis; the bilingual version has man created from the blood of more than one god (1.25),[175] while in Atrahasis he is created from the flesh and blood of one god (I,173);[176] in the bilingual version, unlike Atrahasis (I,189ff.), there is no description of the creation of mankind by Aruru: her only role is to ordain the destinies of men (rev. 17ff.); while such a description might have been found in the break at the end of the obverse, rev. 20 implies rather that man originated in a process of *emersio* rather than *formatio*;[177] the statement of man's function in *KAR* 4 (obv. 27-break after 41; rev. 1-10, 13-24) is far more extensive than that in Atrahasis (I,191,195-197). There are, to be sure, many points of contact between the two texts - especially in the conception of man being created to serve the gods - and these points may have facilitated their being joined; much exegetical ingenuity may well have been exercised in antiquity to harmonize the discrepancies.[178] But no cuneiformist will deny that we are dealing with two stories which were originally independent of each other and reflect in many respects differing viewpoints. This situation is in principle identical with the assumptions of Biblical literary critics regarding the two creation stories in Genesis.

Likewise similar in principle are the composite nature of the Laws of Hammurapi, which is in some respects comparable to the relationship of Biblical law corpora and their narrative frameworks,[179] and of the congregational lament a-ab-ba-ḫu-luḫ-ḫa whose incorporation of two distinct elements resembles the composite Biblical psalms.[180]

The growth of ancient Near Eastern literary compositions by accretion, or supplementation,[181] recalls the "supplementary hypothesis" of Pentateuchal composition.[182] Rofé has recently called for a return to this hypothesis at least in some cases,[183] and in view of the widespread attestation of the process of supplementation outside the Bible this deserves very serious consideration.

The adaptability of liturgical compositions such as "Oh Angry Sea" and šu-íl-lá prayers for use in the cults of different gods in similar to what is presumed to be the case with Psalm 29: that it was originally a Canaanite, specifically North-Syrian, psalm to Baal, which was borrowed with some modification for use in the cult of YHWH;[184] it still retains many features appropriate to Baal. The adaptibility of myths and mythological motifs represented in the Aššur version of Enuma Elish and in several versions of "The Myth of Anzu" resembles what is presumed to be the case with Biblical and post-Biblical references to YHWH's defeat of the sea:[185] this motif is thought to be related to the Canaanite myth of Baal's defeat of the sea as well as Enuma Elish.[186] If Jacobsen is correct, Enuma Elish involves a Mesopotamian borrowing of the very same myth.

For the history of genres we may note a possible parallel in Biblical studies to the monumental origin of certain cuneiform liturgical genres. In 1945 H. L. Ginsberg calling attention to the many phraseological parallels between certain Biblical and other ancient Near Eastern inscriptions of petition and acknowledgement, noted that Isa. 38:9 (the miktab [inscription] of Hezekiah) and the oldest recorded interpretations of miktam in the superscriptions of Pss. 16 and 56-60 all imply that Biblical psalms, too, could take monumental form.[187] This does not yet imply a monumental origin for this genre in Israel, but the monumental origin of the cuneiform genres combined with this evidence at least raises the possibility, and even if it is not borne out for Israel we may at least gain some understanding of the parallels which exist between the psalms and the monuments.

What is significant about the literary-historical parallels we find in cuneiform literature is not simply their similarity to presumed Biblical theories, which lends some plausibility to the latter, but especially the fact that, since in cuneiform literature the original materials are often available for comparison with the later, often combined, forms we can gain some conception of the methods used to combine them - how they were or were not adapted, how harmonization was or was not achieved, and the like. Several of the studies referred to above have done just this - among them Jacobsen's study of the Sumerian King List, Oppenheim's of a motif in the Prayer to the Gods of the Night, and Cooper's of the adaptation of a šu-íl-lá prayer.

G. The relevance of Mesopotamian materials for Biblical literary criticism

Comparative Biblical-cuneiform studies in general raise the question of the channels of transmission of Mesopotamian culture to Israel.[188] Oppenheim has described Palestine as "a region that was apparently only slightly touched by the radiations of Mesopotamian civilization," and notes that "the crucial period during which one could have observed the effect of Mesopotamian influence (middle of the second millenium) is not covered by any primary evidence in the Old Testament;" "Mesopotamian influence on the Old Testament is either secondary (via Ugarit or other, still unknown, intermediaries) or accidental."[189] Oppenheim stresses that it was local elements which shaped the culture of the Levant:

> All told, very few and then mainly secondary cultural achievements of Mesopotamian civilization were preserved and incorporated in the general trend of development that ran westward. This... places in proper relief the miraculous intensity and strength of that light that originated in the backland hills along the easternmost shores of the Mediterranean.[190]

The relevance of the closer levantine culture is stressed especially by Dahood who notes that with the accumulation of literary documents from that area biblists' dependence on more distant civilizations can be reduced.[191] But no matter how optimistic one may be about the multiplication of such documents in the

XUM

future, their present paucity in comparison to the vastness of the Mesopotamian literary remains forces us to remain dependent on the latter.

The question of channels of transmission thus remains with us, and the challenge is increased by Oppenheim's denial of extensive Mesopotamian influence on the cultures of the Mediterranean coast. Although Oppenheim's denial may be unduly extreme, the fact that such a position can be taken illustrates the uncertainty caused by our failure to discover such channels.

Because there is so little evidence available to help answer this question, the comparative approach has often been forced into a position of "if the shoe fits, wear it:" similarities are obvious, therefore comparison and mutual illumination of the parallels are justified, whether or not we can explain the historical connection between them. This seems acceptable so long as we distinguish between comparisons of the sort just mentioned, which restrict themselves to phenomenological descriptions, and comparisons which involve claims of borrowing, influence, and the like. It is the latter sort of comparison for which failure to account for channels of transmission is especially harmful.

The question raised by the present study is slightly different than that usually raised by comparative studies.

Here we have not to account for the transmission of ideas or literature, but to justify the implicit assumption that Israelite scribal - specifically, literary - techniques resembled those of the Mesopotamian academies. We have already quoted Mendenhall's caveat about such an assumption. Is there any evidence which suggests that Israelite practices were at all similar to Mesopotamian?

One approach to this question is to ask whether Israelite scribal practice may ever have been exposed to Mesopotamian. Cuneiform scribal activity in the Syro-Palestinian area during the second millenium is abundantly attested by the archival finds from that time and region. Material from inland areas, from Mari westward to Alalakh, cannot be considered because its distance from Israel renders it largely irrelevant for the present discussion. Two letters and an administrative document from Mari[192] are relevant, however, since they mention delegations of ambassadors traveling between Mari (and even further east) and Hazor (and even further west). While the ambassadors are not said in these letters to be carrying written communications, this is quite possible, even probable; cuneiform writing is attested in Hazor at this time (18th century), as we shall presently note. By far the most extensive archival evidence is that of the Amarna letters, a large number of which involve correspondence with North-Syrian, Phoenician, and Palestinian cities, including Byblos, Beirut, Sidon, Tyre, Hazor, Acco, Megiddo, Jerusalem, Gezer, Ashkelon, Lachish, Schechem, Pella, and the Hebron district.[193] Other discoveries have added documents from Tell-el-Hesi (Eglon?), Taanach, and Jericho.[194] Scribal schools may be presumed for every site where archival finds have been made.[195] The cuneiform medium of this material attests ultimate Mesopotamian connections, while orthographic, paleographic, and linguistic peculiarities attest the development of individualized local scribal traditions and practices.[196] Albright in fact takes one cuneiform letter from Schechem to have been written by a teacher - whether of the scribal art or of music and dancing or some other subject cannot be determined - to the parent of some students.[197]

At least some of these scribal schools produced or used canonical as well as archival cuneiform texts. The oldest cuneiform text so far found in the area is a cuneiform syllabary discovered at Byblos; this text, of a type used in scribal education, dates from before the Ur III period.[198] This discovery dovetails with that at Hazor of a small fragment of ḪAR-ra:*ḫubullu*, a lexical text likewise used in scribal education. The fragment, as yet unpublished, was discovered on the surface at Hazor; Tadmor, who called my attention to it, dates the text by paleography to the late Old Babylonian period.[199]

These tell-tale signs of scribal education, combined with other texts of the same type from Ugarit[200] in the north and Tell-el-Amarna[201] in the southwest, add impressive documentation to our picture of scribal education in this region during the millenium or so preceding the Israelite conquest of Palestine.

Hazor has also yielded school texts of a different type, fragments of inscribed liver models of the type used in training specialists in divination (although Landsberger left "undecided whether [the scribes who produced these fragments] belong to the *tupšarru* [scribe] profession, or to the *bārû* [diviner] profession").[202]

Landsberger dated this model to the late Old Babylonian period, roughly the second half of the seventeenth century. This element of professional education is also attested in uninscribed liver models from Hazor and from 13-12th century Megiddo,[203] and possibly the inscribed models from Ugarit.[204] Following a comparison of the model to its counterparts, both in Mesopotamia and in other peripheral areas, Landsberger concluded:

> Scribal craft and probably also learned extispicy (*bārûtu*) spread from Mari to the Kingdom of Hazor. Though on a very low level and in small dimensions, a local school of scribes identical with or different from the liver experts existed here, and continued until the collapse of the O[ld]B[abylonian] cultural provinces (such as Ḫalab, Alalaḫ) and perhaps even longer, as in Hattušaš.[205]

One further cuneiform inscription from Hazor consists of a personal name incised on a jar of the 18th or 17th century: ^{I}Iš-me-^{d}Adad or ^{I}Iš-me-Ilam^{lam}; the Akkadian rather than West Semitic (Iasmaḫ) form of the predicate has uncertain implications, as it may indicate either Babylonian influence on the local onomasticon or simply that the owner of the jar was a Babylonian, not a native.[206]

Turning finally to literary texts we note the Megiddo fragment of the Gilgamesh epic.[207] The tablet dates from the Amarna period or slightly earlier.[208] Its script is close to that of the Phoenician Amarna letters,[209] showing the copy to be a local product rather than an import, thus further attesting the cuneiform scribal school in this area.[210] Further to the west, in Tell-el-Amarna, as we have already noted, there have been found copies of several literary compositions (Adapa, Nergal and Ereshkigal, Šar Tamḫari [the Sargon Epic]) as well as syllabaries and lexical texts.

This survey suggests that Mesopotamian scribal influence on Israel may have come not only by way of Ugarit but by way of Palestinian cities such as Hazor[211] and Megiddo as well as the many other cities from which Amarna-period letters are attested. Among these cities Jerusalem stands in a unique position since its scribes diverge

XUM

from Canaanite linguistic features in several respects, following instead practices known from texts of Hurrian and Assyrian provenience.[212] Whatever scribal influence came in through Jerusalem may thus have come through Hurrian hands.

Does this evidence of cuneiform writing and the education it required imply that scribes along the Mediterranean coast also learned and practiced the creative redactional techniques of the Mesopotamian scribes? It is true, as we have seen, that peripheral versions of Mesopotamian literature have undergone extensive modification, but it has yet to be demonstrated that this modification involved redactorial techniques similar to those of the Mesopotamian scribes. In some cases the modifications are of a noticeably different type. Thus while Laessøe can observe that in Mesopotamia

> whenever we are in a position to contrast an early version of a literary composition with a later parallel, we discover that the later version is much more elaborate in its language,[213]

we find that peripheral versions often abridge their Mesopotamian originals.[214] While it is certainly possible that western scribes learned Mesopotamian redactorial techniques along with writing, it has yet to be shown that they actually did.

Some slight evidence to this effect may be discernible at Ugarit. There we have abundant evidence of a scribal academy which produced texts in Sumerian, Akkadian, Hittite, and Hurrian, as well as the local Northwest Semitic language, Ugaritic,[215] written in alphabetic cuneiform, in both classical literary and later prose/spoken dialects.[216] The syllabic cuneiform texts include not only the standard syllabaries and lexical texts, but several literary compositions as well.[217] Most important for our purposes, however, are the literary texts written in alphabetic cuneiform. Here we have native Northwest Semitic literature produced by Northwest Semitic scribes who, while they may not have considered themselves ethnically Canaanites[218] shared, in spite of their distance from Israelite Palestine, a literary tradition whose connections with Biblical literature are well-known.[219] Whatever we can discover of literary techniques and evolution at Ugarit will clearly be relevant to our study. And if it can be shown that Ugaritic scribes used techniques which resemble those found in Mesopotamia, then we may well be able to bridge the gap between Mesopotamian and Israelite literary techniques and evolution.

This is an ambitious expectation which available evidence cannot possibly fulfill. Nevertheless there are a few signs that point in the desired direction. A few Ugaritic texts are now available in duplicate thus permitting comparison. For example, the eleven line obverse of RŠ 24.293[220] duplicates I*AB I, 12-22,[221] but the latter contains three lines not found in the former; the extra lines in I*AB consist of parallels to the lines which precede them (e.g. to I*AB's *tḥm bn ilm mt* (which corresponds to RŠ 24.293's *w y^{c} ny bn ilm mt*) there is added the synonymous *hwt ydd bn il ǵzr*, to which nothing in RŠ 24.293 corresponds). This suggests the well-attested phenomenon of development by expansion - we can even specify expansion by parallelism - which has been observed in Mesopotamia, too. In discussing the varying recensions of a number of Ugaritic texts Cassuto wrote:

> At times the poets related in greater detail, in separate poems or in an expanded recension, subjects which appear only in short form in the recension described above (i.e., V AB).[222]

After comparing two particular duplicates of Ugaritic texts Cassuto observed:

> These two fragments are extremely important in that they teach us something about the system of different recensions in Ugaritic literature. We learn from them not only the fact that there were different recensions of the epic poems in Ugarit, which were parallel to each other in content, but also the nature of the differences between the recensionsin the order of the subject matter, in the use of synonymous words, in greater length in certain places and abridgement in other places, and the like. We find a system similar to this in other oriental literatures, too, such as Akkadian literature [in a footnote he referred to H. Otten's *Die Überlieferung des Telepinu-Mythus* for a Hittite example], and it will be possible to learn about this from one literature to another. For Biblical studies, too, we will certainly be able to benefit from careful investigation of this system.[223]

One note of caution, however, must be entered here: while the chronological relationship between the shorter and longer versions is often manifest in the base of Mesopotamian texts, the Ugaritic texts are roughly contemporary and no evidence for the relative earliness vs. lateness of the two has been discovered.[224] Another phenomenon which recalls Mesopotamian analogues is comprised by tablets which appear to contain two separate texts. RŠ 22.225 contains on its obverse a mythological episode about Baal and Anath,[225] while its reverse contains a syllabary.[226] RŠ 24.257 contains on its obverse what appears to be a mythological narrative (though it is possibly a liturgical text),[227] while its reverse contains a list of the kings of Ugarit.[228] It is quite possible that these are nothing more than students' exercise tablets containing sections of texts on which they practiced. Regarding RŠ 22.225 Nougayrol suggested that it was written by a scribe who was more advanced in Ugaritic than in Akkadian so that he wrote a literary Ugartitic text on one side but only simple elementary primer on the other.[229] But when one keeps in mind the combination of the Silbenalphabet with a bilingual creation myth which we discussed above - its existence in two copies shows it to be a literary phenomenon, not merely a student's exercise - one must consider the possibility that these Ugaritic texts, too, represent literary combinations, perhaps supported by some midrashic or more obvious explanations of the reasons for combining the texts.

After the Israelite conquest of Palestine in the late 13th-early 12th century conditions for Israelite exposure to Mesopotamian scribal techniques appear non-existent. Cuneiform writing, and with it a possible channel of Mesopotamian influence, was abandoned in favor of the West Semitic alphabet. The few cuneiform texts which appear in the first millenium represent either foreign products, such as the Sargon stele from Ashdod,[230] or the direct results of Assyrian administration after the fall of the Kingdom of Israel.[231] For the final redaction of the Torah and the literary techniques involved therein one may well think of even later and direct Mesopotamian influence, since this redaction appears to have been the work of Babylonian Jews in the time of Ezra, possibly carried out in Babylonia itself.[232] But for the pre-monarchic and most of the monarchic period whatever exposure there may have been to Mesopotamian techniques must be due to the legacy of the second millennium. The Bible itself hints at the intellectual influence of autochthonous sages in attributing the composition of some psalms to Ezrahites,[233] and this way well reflect ongoing intellectual traditions from the pre-Israelite period.[234]

When all is said and done, direct evidence for

Israelite scribes having been exposed to Mesopotamian literary techniques is, at least for the present, not great. While some of the Ugaritic evidence might be construed as showing similar techniques, even as showing a West Semitic channel of transmission of Mesopotamian techniques to Israel, the Ugaritic material is too limited, and what it shows is too general, to be of great help at the present time.

Is there any circumstantial evidence which could at least make such exposure seem likely? The Hebrews had economic, diplomatic, and military contact with Mesopotamia before and after their settlement, and these contacts undoubtedly facilitated exposure to numerous features of Mesopotamian culture. Examples of loanwords, literary styles and motifs, theological notions, pottery styles, and the like which made their way westward are too well known to need documentation. That part of this traffic included scribal techniques now appears likely in light of Gevaryahu's discovery of colophons within the Biblical text[235] - a scribal technique well-known in Mesopotamia. But redactional techniques are a unique phenomenon which would not necessarily be passed along with the more prosaic procedures of the scribal trade. That this may indeed have happened is not, of course, ruled out. Studies of the sort we are undertaking here may ultimately uncover similarities which cannot be explained otherwise.

But if we concede that for the time being we cannot demonstrate exposure to Mesopotamian techniques, we ought to ask whether there exists any other circumstance which could have caused similarity of techniques. The usual alternative to "influence" is to speak either of a common Semitic mentality[236] or the common Semitic cultural heritage.[237] Either of these, however, must stem from a time and place when literature was still oral, not written, although oral literature may well have been technically similar in many respects to written.[238] Investigation of Arabic literature could help demonstrate some common Semitic features,[239] on the one hand, but similar investigation of Sumerian literature may broaden the picture to one of common Near Eastern techniques. What similarities have been shown with classical literature[240] broaden the picture yet further. When one reckons with possibilities so broad and general, one must begin to ask whether we are not rather dealing with techniques so universal that illustration may indeed be sought anywhere that conditions were roughly the same.[241] And if so the Mesopotamian material would have to be viewed as simply illustrative of literary techniques and evolution in general. If we must thus wonder whether the Mesopotamian material has exclusive or nearly exclusive relevance, still none will deny that it does illustrate how some men have treated their literary heritage and created new literature, thus lending a semblance of plausibility to some theories of Biblical literary history and opening our eyes to other possibilities that internal critical analysis of Biblical literature might never have suggested by itself.

XUM

NOTES TO INTRODUCTION

1. Cf. H. F. Hahn, The OT in Modern Research^{2} (abbrev. OTMR), 1-43; H. D. Hummel, ibid., 287f; C. Koch, The Growth of the Biblical Tradition.

2. For a recent example of the use of these two versions of a narrative in literary criticism see A. Rofé, Israelite Belief in Angels in the Pre-Exilic Period as Evidenced by Biblical Traditions (Hebrew; unpubl. Hebrew University Ph.D. thesis, 1969), 184-203, and "The Texts of II Samuel 24 and I Chronicles 21 and their importance to Biblical criticism and history of religion," a lecture delivered to the 1971 meeting of the AOS (no. 20 in "Abstracts of Communications").

3. For the recensional relationship of the LXX to the MT in general see F. M. Cross, Jr., The Ancient Library of Qumran and Modern Biblical Studies, 163-187.

4. See ibid., 188-194.

5. As recognized by Hobbes, quoted in Eissfeldt, The OT: An Introduction, 160.

6. C. R. North in H. H. Rowley (ed.), The OT in Modern Studies (abbrev. OTMS), 48-83, J. Bright in BANE^{2}, 1-20; H. D. Hummel, OTMR, 267f.; E. A. Speiser, Genesis, XX-XXXVII; see also the references cited by K. A. Kitchen, Ancient Orient and OT, 112 n.1.

7. OTMS, loc. cit.; OTMR, 36 ff., U. Cassuto, The Documentary Hypothesis (Hebrew); M. H. Segal, The Pentateuch; K. A. Kitchen, Ancient Orient and OT (cf. the reviews of W. von Soden, WdO IV/1[1967], 38ff.; E. F. Campbell, JNES 29 [1970], 135-137; C. Cohen, ANES 2 [1970], 105-110; R. K. Harrison, Introduction to the OT, 541, etc. (cf. the review of L. Bailey, JBL 80 [1970], 227). Cf. also J. Bright, BANE^{2}, 1-26; G. E. Mendenhall, BANE^{2}, 29-32.

8. OTMR 119-156, 285-288.

9. B. Childs, JBL 87, 462; 88, 245; J. Muilenberg, JBL 88, 4ff.

10. See the references to Herder and Ewald in Albright, Yahweh and the Gods of Canaan, 1.

11. U. Cassuto, The Documentary Hypothesis (Hebrew), 14-16. In The Rise of the Greek Epic (4th ed. [1934], 107-119)

Gilbert Murray found "the most instructive example of the growth and change of a traditional book under ancient conditions" to be "in the Hebrew scriptures," and he wondered "that the comparison has not been more widely used by Greek scholars" (107). The most recent reflex of Homeric theory in Biblical studies has been the application of Millman Parry's and A. B. Lord's views on oral formulaic composition (cf. the latter's *The Singer of Tales*) to the Book of Psalms by R. Culley, *Oral Formulaic Language in the Psalms*. One point of Culley's position for which I see no justification is the assumption that formulaic language implies that the psalms were composed orally; formulaic language can just as well be used in written compositions, perhaps as a survival from the oral stage (cf. J. R. Porter, *JBL* 77 [1968], 22), though not necessarily. Some cuneiform school texts seem to represent complilations of just such formulae for use in composing written texts (cf. J. J. Finkelstein's remarks on YBC 2177, *HAR-ra: ḫubullu* I-II, and *ana ittišu* in *ANET*^{3}, 525; cf. also W. W. Hallo, *IEJ* 12, 19f.; Finkelstein, *JCS* 11, 88; A. L. Oppenheim [below, n. 48], 294; and H. Dillon, *Assyro-Babylonian Liver Divination*, 21ff., for possible examples from other genres).

12. Cf. Hahn, *OTMR*, 36f.

13. E. Nielsen, *Oral Tradition* (1954), 11-38.

14. Hahn, *OTMR*, 37.

15. P. Koschaker, *Rechtsvergleichende Studien zur Gesetzgebung Hammurabis*, *ZA* 35, 199-212; T. Jacobsen, *The Sumerian King List* (*AS* 11).

16. Cf. the obituary by J. A. Montgomery in *AJSL* 38, 1-11, especially 6f.

17. On the Gilgamesh Epic: *The Religion of Babylonia and Assyria* (abbrev. *RBA*), ch. 23; *AJSL* 15, 193-314; on GE XI, *ZA* 13, 288-301; on *Enuma Eliš*, *Orientalische Studien...Nöldeke*, II 969-982.

18. For the different mediums of cuneiform writing see D. J. Wiseman in P. R. Ackroyd and C. F. Evans (eds.), *The Cambridge History of the Bible* I, 30-35.

19. Cf. R. Biggs, *JCS* 20, 73-88 for the oldest literary texts thus far known, from Abu Salabikh in the middle of the third millennium.

20. S. N. Kramer, "The Epic of Gilgamesh and its Sumerian Sources: A Study in Literary Evolution," *JAOS* 64, 7-23, 83.

21. *BASOR* 94, 3 n. 3.

22. *ANET* 52-57, 106-109; Kramer, *PAPhS* 107, 490-493, 515-516; *Mythologies of the Ancient World*, 10f., 106-115; E. M. Yamauchi, *JBL* 84, 283-290.

23. *RA* 34, 97; cf. Kirk, *Myth*, 109.

24. *JAOS* 63, 73.

25. *JAOS* 64, 14, 15, 16, 18.

26. In Erwin Graf (ed.), *Festschrift Werner Caskel*, 96-110.

27. For the title cf. B. Landsberger, *WZKM* 57, 1-21.

28. *ANET*, 111-113, 614-517.

29. *ANET*, 114-118, 517.

30. All the versions except GE XI are collected in Lambert-Millard, *Atrahasis*. According to Civil (*ibid*., 138f.) the Sumerian version dates from the Late Old Babylonian period, around the end of the 17th century. Since this is the time when the Old Babylonian version of Atrahasis was written (Lambert-Millard, *ibid*., 32, cf. 14), if Civil is correct it becomes questionable whether the Sumerian version is really a forerunner of Atrahasis or merely a counterpart. But it would be surprising if the Akkadian version of the flood did not go back to earlier Sumerian sources (cf. Civil's doubts, *ibid*., 139), whether our Sumerian version was one of them or not.

31. *Bi*. *Or*. 13, 94-96.

32. *Ibid*., 96.

33. As recently called for by von Soden, *XVII^{e} RAI*, 143f.

34. *Op*. *cit*., 96, 100.

35. "Sumerian Motifs of Creation: The Antecedents of the Atrahasis Epic I" (1967; unpubl.).

36. For bibliography see Gurney, *An*. *St*. 5, 93f.; Hoffner, *JCS* 23, 17.

XUM

37. *An*. *St*. 5, 93-113; 6, 163f.

38. *JCS* 11, 83-88.

39. *Ibid*., 88.

40. *Ibid*.

41. Hallo, *XVII^{e} RAI*, 123-133.

42. *Ibid*., 121f.

43. *JAOS* 88, 71-89.

44. a-ab-ba ḫu-luḫ-ḫa: *The History of a Sumerian Congregational Lament* (unpubl. Yale Ph.D. thesis; 1967).

45. *Iraq* 32, 51-67.

46. *Ibid*., 54.

47. Heidel, *BG*^{2}, p. 1; Speiser, *ANET* 62 n. 30.

48. *Oriens Antiquus* (=*Studia Biblica et Orientalia* 3 =*Analecta Biblica* 12), 282-301.

49. *BWL*, 151-154.

50. *JCS* 12 (1958), 22-40, 77-100.

51. E. F. Weidner, *AfO* 14, 172-195; 17, 71-89; list of texts in *AfO* 14, 173-175.

52. *TCS* IV, 20-26; cf. earlier E. Leichty, "Teratological Omens," in *La Divination en Mesopotamie Ancienne* (*14^{e} Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale*), 131,136.

53. Cf. W. W. Hallo, "Checklist of Lexical Texts" (1967, unpubl.).

54. *MSL* XII.

55. *Ibid*., vii-x.

56. *AHw*, 456; Sjöberg, *TCS* III, 150; cf. Hallo-van Dijk, *YNER* 3, 62 n. 65 ("compile").

57. E. Ben Yehuda, *Thesaurus*..., III, 1431f.

58. Lane, *Lexicon*, I, 80.

59. M. Hadas in G. Murray, *The Rise of the Greek Epic*^{4} (Galaxy paperback ed., 1960), iii. Cf. the Sanskrit metaphor of weaving for literary composition and the use of *sutra*, "thread," for "text" (H. Scharfe, "Threads and Texts," lecture delivered to the 1967 meeting of the *AOS*, no. 63 in "Abstracts of Communications").

60. One might think of *aḫbira...b*^{e}*millim* (RSV: "join words together") in Job 16:4 as an example of this conception, but see J. J. Finkelstein, *JBL* 75 (1956), 328-331 on this verse.

61. ŠL 15.158.

62. *CADA*$_2$, 35 and S. Greengus, *JAOS* 89, 529.

63. See Sjöberg, *TCS* III, Introduction. Cf. Hallo and van Dijk *YNER 3*, 9f. on the possible political motivation of part of the combination.

64. Erra V, 42. For discussion see L. Cagni, *L'Epopea di Erra*, 254; *Oppenheim*, *Orientalia* 19, 155.

65. Gudea Statue B, VIII, 21 (*SAKI*, 72; *RA* 45, 62; quoted and translated in Sjöberg, *TCS* III, 150). Cf. Akkadian *kiṣru*, "compilation."

66. For u$_4$-SAR = u$_4$-sakar$_x$ see J. Cooper, *Iraq* 32, 60:16; 67:*sub* 16. But this title for Adapa's composition may be erroneous. See Hallo, *JAOS* 83, 176.

67. Nabonidus Verse Account v,12 (*ANET* 314c).

68. R. Labat, *Hemerologies*....., 162ff.,; discussion: von Soden, *MDOG* 85, 22; W. G. Lambert, *JCS* 11, 8f., with references to earlier literature (n.31); Hunger, *Babylonische und Assyrische Kolophone*, 6.

69. Cf. Reiner, *JNES* 19, 155.

70. *AHw* and Hunger's glossary s.v.; *CADD*, 178 top; H,82b; Z,35a; Leichty, *Oppenheim AV*, 151. But this definition requires more explicit demonstration. In medieval Arabic and Hebrew the verb (נסח, نسخ) refers simply to copying, with no implication that the text has been copied only partially. While the Akkadian noun *nisḫu* means "excerpt," a superficial review of the attestations of the verbal form *nasāḫu* has not ruled out the meaning "copy," and so it is translated in *CADA*$_2$, 35b (quoting *ARM* 1, 37:22).

71. *CADD*, 73d *sub* 9.

XUM

72. *CADA*$_1$, 212a.

73. *Ibid.*, a-b. (To the definition "additional" cf. the rabbinic term *tosefet* for a tannaitic statement outside of the Mishna, and *tosefta* for the collection of such statements.) In *ABL* 453 rev. 15, quoted by *CAD*, the term *qurbu* occurs along with *aḫû*, and in virtue of its position in the context as well as its etymology one might think it is antithetical to the latter and is thus another term for "canonical." However, both the *CAD* and Oppenheim (*Centaurus* 14, 98) render it "pertinent," apparently because another word for "canonical" (*damqu*) already occurs earlier in the sentence.

74. *CADA*$_1$, 212a.

75. Like rabbinic *baraita* (an individual tannaitic statement not included in the Mishna) and *ḫiṣōn* (with reference to non-canonical or heretical books the precise referent of the term is debated [see Sid Z. Leiman, *The Talmudic and Midrashic Evidence for the Canonization of Hebrew Scripture*, unpubl. Pennsylvania Ph.D. dissertation (1970), 189ff.] and possibly in the *hapax legomenon mišna haḫiṣōnā* [Canticles Rabba 6:9] with reference to the Tosefta or some other collection of *baraitot* [cf. H. Strack, Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash, 238 sub 18]). Students of rabbinic literature will be interested to note that, as with tannaitic statements not included in the Mishna, non-canonical entries in omen literature were collected and at times consulted, implying that they were accorded a measure of authority (cf. references collected in *CADA*$_1$, 212a-b, and cf. Oppenheim, *Centaurus* 14, 123).

76. See Lambert, *An. St.* 20, 110, for double readings and what Lambert calls "perhaps the earliest apparatus criticus;" cf. *BWL* 102:80; Sachs *JCS* 6, 67:32. For double readings in the Massoretic Text see Talmon's article by that name in *Textus* 1, 144-184.

77. Cf. F. Jacoby, *Die Fragmente der Griechische Historiker*, IIIC, No. 680, pp. 369ff.; Heidel, *GE*^{2}, 116-119, Lambert-Millard, *Atrahasis*, 134-137; J. J. A. van Dijk, *SSA*, 17-21; *UVB* 18 (1962), 44-52 and pl. 27; E. Reiner, Or. 30, 1-11; Hallo, *JAOS* 83 (1963), 174-176; Lambert, *Bi. Or.* 13 (1956), 144; D. O. Edzard in Haussig, *WbM* I, s.vv. "Abgal," "Mischwesen," "Oannes;" *CAD* and *AHw* s.v. *apkallu*; note that Lambert missed the reference in the Fürstenspiegel (*BWL* 112f.) lines 4 and 10

(NUN.ME = *apkallu*), cf. I. M. Diakonov, *AS* 16, 347 with n. 20. I have studied the *apkallu*-traditions in an unpublished paper "Biblical and Mesopotamian Antediluvian Traditions" (1968). See now Hallo, *JCS* 23, 57-67 (but contrary to p. 65 n. 103), Lambert refers to antediluvian *apkallus* [*JCS* 11,9].

78. Cf. the Berossus fragments in Jacoby, *op. cit.*, and the list published by van Dijk, *UVB* 18, p. 44.

79. Cf. the Adapa myth (*ANET*, 101ff.), fragment A, passim; in *UVB* 18, 44:1 he is connected with *A-a-lu*, who is the Alulim of the King-list (van Dijk, *ibid.*, p. 47), the king of Eridu.

80. Jacobsen, *SKL*, 70:3.

81. The last *apkallu* is connected in *UVB* 18, 44:7 with Enmeduranki, King of Sippar (Jacobsen, *SKL* 74: 26; Lambert, *JCS* 21, 126ff).

82. Heidel, *GE*^{2}, 117f.; Lambert-Millard, *Atrahasis*, 135ff.; Lambert, *JCS* 21, 127. Jewish tradition also described attempts to preserve wisdom during the flood; cf. L. Ginzberg, *The Legends of the Jews*, I, 122, 157.

83. In a lecture entitled "The Structure of Biblical Books and Mesopotamian Scribal Customs," delivered at Yale University, March 1, 1971.

84. Th. Jacobsen, *The Sumerian King List*, 55-65. Cf. the new textual evidence published by Finkelstein, *JCS* 17, 39-51, and his further discussion of the stylistic discrepancies; Hallo, *JCS* 17, 54 and 56f. (for the last note the strictures of Lambert-Millard, *Atrahasis*, 25).

85. *Ibid*.

86. Cf. Hallo, *JCS* 23, 63.

87. For the following see C. J. Gadd, *Iraq* 4, 33f; J. Laessøe, *Bi. Or.* 13, 98-101; A. K. Grayson, *ANET*^{3}, 512f.

88. For the join cf. Landsberger, *AfO Beiband* I, 170, 177; Weidner, *AJSL* 38, 209; Leichty, *Catalogue*, p. 92 sub K4175+; Lambert-Millard, *Atrahasis*, 35.

89. For a translation of the better preserved *KAR* 4 see Heidel, *BG*^{2}, 68-71.

90. 80-7-19,184 (*CT* 18:47) and 82-3-23,146 (*RA* 17, 189); Lambert-Millard, *Atrahasis*, 35.

91. *KAR* 4, colophon; transliterated and translated in H. Hunger, *Babylonische und assyrische Kolophone*, no. 50; on AL.TIL cf. E. Leichty, "The Colophon," *Oppenheim AV*, 149.

92. Landsberger, *AfO Beiband I*, 170-178; in M. Çiǧ & H. Kizilyay, *Zwei Altbabylonische Schulbücher aus Nippur*, 97-116; E. Sollberger, *AS* 16, 21-28; J. Nougayrol, *ibid*., 31-39.

93. *AfO Beiband* I, 177f.; in Çiǧ & Kizilyay, *op*. *cit*., 116; Gadd, *Iraq* 4, 34.

94. *Iraq* 4, 33.

95. Letter of March 22, 1971.

96. Laessøe, *Bi*. *Or*. 13, 99, preceded by Gadd, *Iraq* 4, 33, and followed by Grayson, *ANET*^{3}, 512f., Hallo, *IEJ* 12, 24 n. 52, is less certain, referring only to "a kind of series."

97. The following stricture is my own, but it was preceded in all essentials and discussed in detail by Peter B. Machinist, "'Silbenalphabet A,' a Bilingual Account of the Creation of Man, and the Atrahasis Epic" (1968, unpubl.). He also exposes the fallacy of the generally held view (e.g. Laessøe, *Bi*. *Or*. 13, 99, Grayson, *ANET*^{3}, 512f.) that the alleged Nineveh version had "Silbenalphabet A" as its first tablet and the bilingual account as its second, by recalling the fact that these two texts occur in both copies on a single tablet, and *both* of them constitute the second tablet of their series. Machinist argues that the catchline refers to a separate series. I differ from him only in holding that the common view which considers Atrahasis part of the same series is not less plausible.

98. Leichty, "The Colophon," 148.

99. Cf. Hallo, *IEJ* 12, 24.

100. *JCS* 21, 42 with n. 5, and Addenda, 48. Cf. below, n. 156.

101. *Ibid*. 42 n. 5. The presumed hymn may also have originated on a stela; cf. Hallo, *XVII*^{e} *RAI*, 121.

102. Cf. his remarks in *ANET*^{3}, 525.

XUM

103. JCS 15, 103f.; cf. also JAOS 86, 367f.

104. JCS 15, 100-104.

105. JAOS 63, 69-73. The same was done on a more extensive basis for the first tablet of the Atrahasis Epic by Tikva S. Frymer (above, n. 35).

106. JAOS 63, 70 n. 3.

107. JAOS 88, 104-108.

108. Meissner, MVAG 7/1; ANET 90. The comparison is cited by G. Barton, Ecclesiastes, who credits H. Grimme, OLZ 8, col. 432ff., with the observation.

109. ANET 468.

110. R. Gordis, Koheleth: The Man and His World[3], 304. Gordis' sweeping denial of similarities between Eccl. and Gilgamesh is unjustified by the text itself.

111. From the Stone Age to Christianity (Anchor Books ed.), 67.

112. Apud H. L. Ginsberg in A. Altmann (ed.), Biblical and Other Studies, 58f. (the wording is Ginsberg's).

113. BG^2, 129.

114. Genesis, 9f.

115. Journal of Theological Studies 16, 287-300. On Hurrian intermediacy cf. Speiser, Oriental and Biblical Studies, 265-269.

116. Tarbiz 37 (5728=1967/1968), 112f.

117. ANET 417d.

118. Ginsberg, op. cit., 59; Heidel, BG^2, 130-139, especially 139.

119. KUB IV:12 (GETh, 43f.).

120. A. Goetze and S. Levy, ᶜAtiqot 2, 121-128. The alleged Gilgamesh fragment from Ras Shamra (Nougayrol, Ugaritica V, 304-310) is probably not related to Gilgamesh (W. von Soden, Ugaritforschungen I, 195).

121. For Bibliography see GSL p. 9, b, nos. 25-32a; A. Kammenhuber, Münchner Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft 21, 45-58; E. von Schuler, in Haussig, WbM, 165f. For the latest fragments see KBo 19, nos. 114-125.

122. KUB 36, 74 (see J. Siegelova, Ar. Or. 38 [1970] 135-139).

123. E. Reiner and H. G. Güterbock, JCS 21, 255-266.

124. Laroche, RA 58 (1964), 69-78; Nougayrol and Laroche, Ug. V, 310ff. and 773ff.

125. Ugaritica V, No. 167, pp. 300-304; Lambert-Millard, Atrahasis, 131-133.

126. J. Knudtzon, EA, 969ff.; Gurney, An. St. 10 (1960), 105-131.

127. See the introductory notes by Speiser and Grayson in ANET, 111 and 514; Oppenheim, Ancient Mesopotamia, 263.

128. Introductory note in ANET, 114; Oppenheim, Ancient Mesopotamia, 263.

129. An. St. 10, 107.

130. Journal of Theological Studies N. S. 16, 300. These and the following examples should lay to rest objections such as those raised by A. R. Millard, Tyndale Bulletin 18 (1967), 17, against the view that the Biblical flood story was borrowed from Mesopotamia. He argued:

> All who suspect or suggest borrowing by the Hebrews are compelled to admit large-schale revision, alteration, and reinterpretation in a fashion which cannot be substantiated for any other composition from the Ancient Near East or in any other Hebrew writing.

To Millard the true explanation for the similarities between the Biblical and Mesopotamian flood stories is that both remembered similar details of the same historical event.

131. E. von Schuler, in Haussig, WbM, 166.

132. H. Otten, Istanbuler Mitteilungen 8, 96.

133. Ibid.

134. Ibid., 119f.

135. Otten, in GSL, 140; von Schuler, in Haussig, WbM, 166.

136. Oppenheim, in Analecta Biblica 12, 292, asserts that "all literary texts in Akkadian that come from the Hittite capital...preserve an old Babylonian original," though the wording is often somewhat garbled. However, this question has never been thoroughly investigated. See below, Ch. I,B.

137. See below, § G, especially n. 188.

138. A. Shaffer, Eretz Israel 8 (1967), 247-50 (Hebrew; Eng. summary, 75*) and 9(1969), 159f. (Heb.; Eng. sum., Eng. sect., 138f.); Tigay, JBL 79, 184 n. 37. Shaffer's suggestion is dismissed all too quickly by Landsberger, RA 62 (1968), 109 n. 37. The motif of "three" is uncalled for in Eccl's disquisition on friendship; it can be explained only as having been taken over along with the more relevant imagery with which it was originally associated in the Gilgamesh passages or some common forerunner (cf. Shaffer, Eretz Israel 8, 248).

139. The parallel is to the description of Enkidu's early life in GE I, ii. See J. Tigay, "Garden of Eden," in the forthcoming Encyclopedia Judaica. The parallel was already noted by P. Jensen, Das Gilgamesch-Epos in der Weltliteratur I, 195ff.; C. A. Williams, Oriental Affinities of the Legend of the Hairy Anchorite I, 50f. (ref. court. Prof. T. H. Gaster).

140. Ginsberg, loc. cit. (above, n. 112).

141. Ginsberg, ANET 427; Reiner, Or. 30, 7f.; van Dijk, UVB 18, 51f.

142. A. E. Cowley, Aramaic Papyri of the Fifth Century B. C. (1923), 204-248; Ginsberg, ANET, 427-430.

143. Abbrev. FSAC. References are to the second edition (Doubleday Anchor Books, 1957).

144. P. 76

145. In their brevity some of Albright's remarks are difficult to understand, and I have had to resort in some cases to paraphrase to express what I believe he intends.

146. For some exceptions to the general anonymity of cuneiform literature cf. Hallo, IEJ 12, 14ff.; YNER 3, 1-3; and Lambert, JCS 11, 1-14; 16, 59-77;

cf. above, n. 65. For further acrostics with the author's name see now R. F. G. Sweet, Or.38, 459f. The royal authorship of law collections ought to be considered in this connection, too. See most recently S. Paul, Studies in the Book of the Covenant, 8. On stereotypicality in cuneiform literature cf. Oppenheim, Analecta Biblica 12 (above, n. 48).

147. Cf. H. Gunkel, What Remains of the OT, 58f.; cf. Finkelstein, JCS 11, 88 for a cuneiform example.

148. Cf. Oppenheim, op. cit.

149. Cf. A. Falkenstein, CRRAI 2, 13.

150. Cf. Albright in AJA 54, 163. This principle underlies the subsequent efforts of Albright and his students to reconstruct the presumed original orthography of Biblical poems by ignoring the matres lectionis and the masoretic vocalization. See Albright in H. H. Rowley (ed.), Studies in OT Prophecy, 1-18; HUCA 33/I, 1-39; JBL 63, 207-233; F. M. Cross, Jr., and D. N. Freedman, JBL 67, 191-210; 72, 15-34; Cross, Studies in Early Yahwistic Poetry. This procedure has been carried to its extreme development in the work of M. J. Dahood. For a critique of the approach see D. W. Watson, Text-Restoration Methods in Contemporary U. S. A. Biblical Scholarship (1970; unavailable to me).

151. FSAC, 79f.;cf. A. L. Oppenheim, Ancient Mesopotamia, 249. Tadmor has noted independently that this is true of the royal annals: they develop by expanding rather than shrinking (oral communication). Kramer notes that the Kish tablet of "Gilgamesh and the Land of the Living" "seems to have a much more expanded text than our reconstructed version" (JCS I, 7); Cf. Laessøe, Pedersen AV, p. 210 (quoted below, above n. 213).

152. M. Greenberg, Understanding Exodus, Part I, 103, understands Albright's remarks to imply that

> ...a primary principle of the redaction, in all of its stages, seems to have been preservation of every significant aspect of any given matter. Insignificant tradition-variants were omitted, with the result that the present text may be regarded as exhibiting the maximal variations and the maximal riches of old Israel's stock of traditions.

Cf. also ibid., 196.

153. For cuneiform evidence of this procedure add to Albright's note 57: J. J. Finkelstein, *JAOS* 86, 368; for omen literature cf. *idem.*, *PAPhS* 107, 465f., n. 17; Leichty, *TCS* IV, 20-26. The Decalogue is presumed by many to have grown in this way; cf. J. J. Stamm-M. E. Andrew, *The Ten Commandments in Recent Research*, 18-22; E. Nielsen, *The Ten Commandments in New Perspective*, 96-105; note the section on abbreviations, pp. 105-112; C. Koch, *The Growth of the Biblical Tradition*, 44-48.

154. C. H. Gordon, *Ugaritic Literature*, 6.

155. *Idem.*, *HUCA* 26, 97.

156. *Idem.*, *Ugaritic Literature*, 6f.; cf. also Albright, *AJA* 54, 163. The dichotomy between frame (i.e., prologue and epilogue) and corpus in the law collections and several other genres has now been studied by S. M. Paul, *Studies in the Book of the Covenant in the Light of Cuneiform and Biblical Law*, 11-26.

157. Gordon, *op. cit.*, 132.

158. Gordon, *op. cit.*, 7.

159. Albright, *AJA* 54, 163.

160. *AJA* 54, 163f.; cf. also *VTS* III, 4.

161. *BANE*^{2}, 30.

162. *Ibid.*, 31.

163. In Hyatt (ed.), *The Bible in Modern Scholarship*, 37-43.

164. *Ibid.*, 41ff.

165. *IEJ* 12, 12f.

166. *Ibid.*, 26.

167. *Ancient Orient and Old Testament* (1966). This book originated in two lectures delivered in 1962, which were eventually worked into a German book in 1965, then thoroughly revised into the 1966 English work.

168. *Ibid.*, 131.

169. *Ibid.*, 116-129.

XUM

170. *Ibid.*, 114f.

171. If one seeks an "extrabiblical" example of the kind of documentary conflation presumed by the documentary hypothesis, one can hardly do better than refer to the Samaritan Pentateuch's version of the Sinai-Decalogue pericope in Exodus, which incorporates much material from another "source" - Deuteronomy's version of the same events, also adding material from Deut. 27.

172. Kitchen, *op. cit.*, 117, 121, 123, 124, 125, 126.

173. *Ibid.*, 134.

174. Here, too, my remarks were anticipated by Machinist (see above, n. 97).

175. Possibly two gods; cf. Heidel, *BG*^{2}, 69 n. 52.

176. This remains true even if the meaning of *ištēn* in this line is "leader" (W. L. Moran, *BASOR* 200, 51f.).

177. On the two methods cf. van Dijk, *Acta Orientalia* 28, 23.

178. Their methods may well have resembled those of Kitchen, *op. cit.*, 118f. with n. 19, and of Cassuto in *The Documentary Hypothesis* and in his commentaries.

179. Cf. M. Paul, *Studies in the Book of the Covenant in the Light of Cuneiform and Biblical Law*, 11-42.

180. On these psalms see R. J. Tournay, *RB* 54, 521-542; 56, 37-60.

181. Above, nn. 151, 153, and below, n. 213.

182. Rowley, *OTMS*, 47; Hahn, *OTMR*, 4; R. H. Pfeiffer, *Introduction to the OT*, refers to it as the "development hypothesis."

183. Above, n. 2.

184. H. L. Ginsberg, *Atti del XIX Congresso Internazionale degli Orientalisti* (1935), 472-476; *Kitbe Ugarit*, 129-131; T. H. Gaster, *Thespis*^{2}, 443-446; Dahood, *Psalms I*, 174-180. Note the strictures of Gordis, *JQR* 61, 94f. and esp. 100f., regarding channels of transmission.

185. See Cassuto, *The Goddess Anath* [Hebrew], 29f., 55f.

186. Cassuto, ibid., 55f.; Sarna, JBL 81 (1962), 160ff. and literature cited there; Gaster, Thespis^2, 442ff.; Y. Kaufmann, The Religion of Israel, 62; Lambert, Journal of Theol. St. 16, 290; Dahood, Psalms III, XXIII.

187. Louis Ginzberg Jubilee Volume, 159-171.

188. R. Gordis, Koheleth,^{3} 415; JQR 61, 94f., 100f.; Lambert, JThS 16, 299f. speaks of Hurrian intermediacy in the Amarna period; C. Gordon, Before the Bible, 19f. and passim, considers the Amarna period the most important period of borrowing; on channels of transmission in general see Gordon's chapter by that name, pp. 22-46.

189. Oppenheim, Ancient Mesopotamia, 72f.

190. Ibid., 73.

191. Dahood, Psalms I, XXVI-XXVII; Psalms III, XXII-XXIV.

192. A. Malamat, JBL 79, 13ff.; Glueck AV, 164f.

193. J. A. Knudtzon, Die El Amarna-Tafeln; A. F. Rainey, El Amarna Tablet, 359-379 (A.O.A.T. 8; 1970); Albright, ANET, 483-490, with notes. On a letter (or letters) from Ugarit see Albright, BASOR 95, 30-33.

194. Albright, CAH^2, fasc. 51, "The Amarna Letters from Palestine," 3.

195. A. Rainey, "The Scribe at Ugarit," Proceedings of the Israel Academy of Sciences and the Humanities 3, 126.

196. Albright, CAH^2, fasc. 51, 4. See his articles listed in the bibliography there, 21.

197. BASOR 86, 28-31 and ANET 490; against this interpretation, B. Landsberger, JCS 8, 59 n. 121; Albright's rejoinder, BASOR 139, 22f.

198. Albright, BASOR 163, 45; Prof. Hallo believes the text probably is pre Ur-III, not Ur-III as stated in his name ibid., n. 46.

199. See now A. Malamat in Eretz Israel 9, 103, and Glueck AV, 166f.

XUM

200. J. Krecher in *Ugaritforschungen* I.

201. Knudtzon, *EA*, nos. 348, 350-354.

202. Landsberger and Tadmor, *IEJ* 14, 201-218. The quotation is from 213 n. 34.

203. *Ibid*. 205, 208 n. 16.

204. Schaeffer, *AfO* 20, 215; Virolleaud, *CRAIB* 1963, 93f. The texts read as inquiries, but this does not necessarily rule out their being school texts.

205. Landsberger-Tadmor, *op. cit.*, 216.

206. See the discussion of Malamat, *JBL* 79, 18 with nn. 32f., and *Glueck AV*, 168.

207. A. Goetze and S. Levy, ^{c}*Atiqot* 2, 121-128.

208. *Ibid*., 128; Landsberger, *IEJ* 14, 214.

209. Goetze and Levy, *op. cit.*, 128.

210. Albright, *CAH*^{2}, fasc. 51, 4.

211. Cf. Malamat, *Glueck AV*, 164-177.

212. Moran, *BANE*^{2}, 79 n. 42.

213. *Pedersen AV*, 210.

214. Above, text to nn. 129, 131, and 132.

215. Rainey, *op. cit.*, 129f.

216. Gordon, *UT* §§ 9.3; 13.46-50, 106; M. Held, *JAOS* 79, 174f. with nn. 95-107; B. A. Levine, *JCS* 17, 110f.; Albright, *Yahweh and the Gods of Canaan*, 8 with n. 21.

217. *Ugaritica* V, 265-319.

218. Rainey, *IEJ* 13, 43-45; 14, 101.

219. See, e.g., Albright, *Yahweh and the Gods of Canaan*, 4-8; Gordon, *UT* §§ 14.3-4; 17.3-4; Dahood, *Psalms* I, XXXIII-XXXV; Ginsberg, *BA* 8/2 (1945), 41-58.

220. *Ug*. V, Ch. III, No. 4, 559f.

221. *UT* 67.

XUM

222. *The Goddess Anath* [Hebrew], 54.

223. *Ibid*., 105f.

224. In fact, the longer I*AB contains the archaic feminine ending -*y* (see J. C. de Moor, *Ugarit-forschungen* I, 186 *sub* Obv. 6) while RŠ 24.293 contains the normal ending -*t*, so that one might argue that the longer version is the earlier, though this is hardly compelling.

225. Virolleaud, *CRAIB* 1960, 180-186.

226. Nougayrol, *AS* 16, 29f.

227. *Ug*. V, Ch. III, No. 5, pp. 561f.

228. Virolleaud, *CRAIB* 1962, 94f.; *AfO* 20, 214f.; M. Drower, *CAH*^{2}, fasc. 63, 5.

229. *AS* 16, 27.

230. Tadmor, *Eretz Israel* 8, 241-245.

231. R. W. Hamilton, "Gezer," *IDB* II, 389c.

232. For the date cf. Kaufmann, *History of Israelite Religion* (Heb.) IV, 343f. Note, by the way, the designation of Ezra as *sofer mahir* (Ez. 7:6), which is paralleled in Ps. 45:2 and in the Elephantine Aḥiqar papyrus, line 1: *swfr ḫkym wmhyr*. Now that the alleged Egyptian derivation of this term has been challenged (A. Rainey, *JNES* 26, 58-60), one may compare the frequent statement in Mesopotamian colophons that the scribe has copied or excerpted a text quickly (*hanṭiš*; see Hunger, *Kolophone*, glossary, s.v.),

233. Ps. 88:1; 89:1. For Ezrahite meaning "autochthonous, aboriginal," see Albright, *ARI*^{4}, 210 n. 95.

234. See Albright, *ibid*., 125ff.; *Yahweh and the Gods of Canaan*, 244-253. Albright's discussion stresses the musical activity of the autochthonous sages, but I Ki. 5:11 connects Ethan the Ezrahite with proverbial wisdom, too. For the mediating role of cities not destroyed in the Israelite invasion cf. the remark of M. Smith, *JBL* 88 (1969), 27.

235. *Beth Mikra* 93 (1970), 368-370.

236. Cf. Th. Bowman, *Hebrew Thought Compared with Greek* (E. T. 1960).

237. Cf. W. Robertson Smith, *Lectures on the Religion of the Semites*^{2} (1914); S. Moscati, *Ancient Semitic Civilizations* (1957).

238. Eissfeldt, *The OT*, 6; Nielsen, *Oral Tradition*, 33.

239. See recently J. R. Porter, "Pre-Islamic Arabic Historical Traditions and the Early Historical Narratives of the Old Testament," *JBL* 77, 17-26; on the parallel Islamic and Israelite conquest traditions cf. the comments of Greenberg in *The Bible in Modern Scholarship*,39f.

240. Above, nn. 10-13.

241. Thus mitigating the objections expressed above in the text to n. 14.

XUM

Ch. I. The Literary Criticism of the Gilgamesh Epic

The Gilgamesh Epic, "the most significant literary creation of the whole of ancient Mesopotamia,"[1] is best attested in a "canonical" version (abbreviated GE) from the library of Assurbanipal (668-627) in Nineveh, with more or less closely related, roughly contemporaneous, texts from Assur, Sultantepe and Babylon. Besides the late canonical version we have, from the second millennium, substantially different Akkadian texts of the Middle Babylonian period from Megiddo[2] and Boghazköi, Hittite and Hurrian translations of the same period from Boghazköi, Akkadian texts of the Old Babylonian period from several sites, and Sumerian texts of the same period, but presumably copied from older tablets.[3] It is generally agreed today that the canonical version was composed in the last half or quarter of the second millennium, probably in the Kassite period.[4] A literary catalogue attributes the epic, presumably in its canonical version, to one Sin-liqi-unninni,[5] and Lambert has shown that this name goes back to the Kassite period[6] (although one very late text considers Sin-liqi-unninni a contemporary of Gilgamesh himself[7]). The catalogue refers to EŠ.GAR ^{d}Gilgameš: ša pi-i ^{Id}Sin-li-qi-un-nin-ni..., "the series of Gilgamesh, by Sin-liqi-unninni," but the precise meaning of ša pi is uncertain[8] and so, too, is the nature of Sin-liqi-unninni's contribution.[9]

A. The Sources of the Epic

Since S. N. Kramer's 1944 study "The Epic of Gilgameš and its Sumerian Sources: A Study in Literary Evolution"[10] it has become commonplace that the Gilgamesh Epic is a composite based on originally unconnected single episodes first joined together into a literary whole, with a unified theme, by later hands.[11] As Kramer himself stressed,[12] the persuasiveness of his study lay in the actual availability of copies of the earlier sources, so that it was unnecessary to rely solely on critical analysis of the final epic, which remains hypothetical no matter how rigorously argued. On the basis of the latter technique, however, the composite nature of the Gilgamesh Epic had been suggested several decades earlier by M. Jastrow.[13]

Jastrow discerned four main elements in the epic:[14]

Actual adventures of Gilgamesh: 1. "the conquest of Erech, his victory over Khumbaba, the killing of the divine bull, and the strangling of the lion."[15]

Episodes originally unrelated to the epic:

2. The story of Enkidu, the hierodule and the hunter.[16]

3. "The story of Gilgamesh's wanderings to [Mt.] Mashu and his encounter with" Utnapishtim[17] (the latter's narrative being itself composite[18]).

4. The twelfth tablet, a scholastic addition to the epic which is really a doublet of Gilgamesh's wanderings in the earlier tablets.[19]

Jastrow concluded that "Gilgamesh is merely a peg upon which various traditions and myths are hung,"[20] "a medium for the perpetuation of various popular traditions and myths;"[21] Gilgamesh was "a favorite personage, to whom floating traditions were attached, in part by popular fancy and in part by the deliberate efforts of literary compilers."[22]

Two decades later, following the discovery of the Pennsylvania and Yale tablets of the Old Babylonian version of the epic, Jastrow revised his analysis.[23] He now concluded, inter alia, that it was in fact Enkidu who was the original hero of the Huwawa and Bull of Heaven episodes, which were transferred to Gilgamesh only secondarily. Gilgamesh and Enkidu were both fabled conquerors of parts of Babylonia. The epics narrating their exploits were combined into a single epic. He outlined "four main currents that flow together in" GE:

1. The adventures of Enkidu;
2. the adventures of Gilgamesh;
3. nature myths and didactic tales transferred to Gilgamesh and Enkidu; and
4. the process of weaving all these together, in the course of which Gilgamesh became the main hero. .

Although P. Jensen registered a brief objection to Jastrow's original analysis of the epic,[24] analyses of the same type were offered subsequently by such scholars as R. Campbell Thompson[25] and A. Leo Oppenheim.[26]

Several of Jastrow's original hypotheses were confirmed, with textual evidence, by Kramer in his 1944 study. There Kramer surveyed all the Sumerian Gilgamesh material, published and unpublished, known to him at the time, and described the contents of the six[27] compositions it formed: (1) Gilgamesh and Huwawa - later[28] renamed Gilgamesh and the Land of the Living, (2) Gilgamesh and the 'Bull of Heaven,' (3) The Deluge - not really a Gilgamesh piece in its Sumerian form, (4) The Death of Gilgamesh, (5) Gilgamesh and Agga of Kish, (6) Gilgamesh, Enkidu and the Netherworld - formerly called 'Gilgamesh and the ḫuluppu-tree.[29] Comparing the plots of the first two episodes with their later Akkadian counterparts (in GE II-VI) Kramer concluded that the Sumerian compositions were undoubtedly sources of the Akkadian but that, just as in the case of the Sumerian and Akkadian versions of Inanna/Ishtar's Descent to the Nether World[30] their similarities were limited to the broad outlines of the plot, with details varying so widely that the basic relationship is at times difficult to recognize.[31] The Sumerian Deluge episode had nothing to do with Gilgamesh but was a narrative beginning with creation and continuing through the flood to the immortalization of Ziusudra (the Sumerian name of GE XI's

Utnapishtim). The Akkadian version in the Gilgamesh Epic had omitted the material on creation and changed the third-person style of the narrative to first-person so that Utnapishtim himself could be the narrator.[32] Several other details, again, were different.[33] The remains of the fourth composition, The Death of Gilgamesh, begin with a reference to Gilgamesh seeking immortality, as he allegedly was in Gilgamesh and the Land of the Living, so Kramer considered it possible that this was in fact the continuation of the latter composition, whose end was still missing.[34] Since Kramer later changed his view that Gilgamesh was seeking immortality in Gilgamesh and the Land of the Living,[35] and since the end of that composition was subsequently discovered and seen to have nothing to do with The Death of Gilgamesh,[36] this suggestion was clearly erroneous.[37] The Death of Gilgamesh included a statement to Gilgamesh by an unknown speaker that kingship, heroism, and the like, had been granted him, but not eternal life; it then described his death. Kramer concluded that this poem displayed "an indubitable source relationship to portions of" GE IX-XI "which contain Gilgameš's plea for eternal life, and the rejoinder that it is death, not immortality, which is man's fate."[38] Strangely, however, GE mentioned nothing of Gilgamesh's death. The fifth composition, Gilgamesh and Agga, had no counterpart in GE.[39] Finally, the sixth Sumerian composition was seen to be the forerunner of GE XII, but with these differences: GE XII set in only in the middle of the original story, the first half being omitted;[40] XII was a literal translation of the Sumerian text rather than a creative adaptation, as other parts of GE were.[41] Knowledge of the entire composition, with its contradictions of GE itself, confirmed that GE XII was an inorganic appendage to the eleven tablets which constitute the original Akkadian composition.

At the outset of his study Kramer had posited three questions which he now answered on the basis of the above evidence:

> (a) Is there a Sumerian original of the Babylonian Epic of Gilgameš as a whole. Obviously not. The Sumerian poems vary considerably in length, and consist of individual disconnected tales. The plot sequence of the Babylonian epic by means of which the several episodes are so modified and connected as to form a reasonably integrated unit, is clearly a Babylonian innovation and achievement.
> (b) Are we in a position to identify those episodes in the Babylonian epic which go back to Sumerian prototypes? Yes. The Ḫuwawa episode (Tablets III-V of the epic), the 'bull of heaven' episode (Tablet VI), portions of the 'quest for immortality' episode (Tablets IX, X, XI), the 'deluge' story (Chapter XI), all have their Sumerian counterparts. As repeatedly stressed, however, the Babylonian versions are no slavish reproductions of their Sumerian originals; it is only the broad outlines of the plot that they have in common.
> (c) But what of those portions of the Epic of Gilgameš for which no Sumerian prototypes are yet at our disposal...? Are these of Babylonian origin, or do they, too, go back to Sumerian sources?[42]

Kramer then offered for the third question a number of suggestions which, because of the limited evidence, he regarded as hypothetical. Since the epic's prologue is unparalleled in Sumerian literature, Kramer held it to be a

Babylonian innovation. The chain of events culminating in the friendship of Gilgamesh and Enkidu is intended to motivate that friendship; since the friendship is absent in the Sumerian version, where Enkidu is always Gilgamesh's slave,[43] the chain is not likely to have existed in Sumerian Gilgamesh texts, although some of its elements may have existed separately and not necessarily in connection with Gilgamesh tales.[44] (This presumption is confirmed below, Ch. IV-VI.) The epic's version of the death of Enkidu, concluded Kramer, was not of Sumerian origin, since Gilgamesh, Enkidu, and the Netherworld had a different version of Enkidu's demise.

> The incident of the death of Enkidu was invented by the Babylonian authors of the Epic of Gilgameš in order to motivate dramatically Gilgameš's quest for immortality which climaxes the poem.[45]

Kramer summed up the results of his research as follows:

> Of the various individual episodes comprising the Epic of Gilgameš, several go back to Sumerian prototypes actually involving the hero Gilgameš. Moreover, even in the case of those episodes which lack such Sumerian counterparts, most of the detached, individual motifs reflect Sumerian mythic and epic sources. In no case, however, do the Babylonian poets copy slavishly their Sumerian material; they so modify its content, and mold its form, in accordance with their own temper and heritage, that only the bare nucleus of the Sumerian material remains recognizable. As for the plot-structure of the epic as a whole, the forceful and fateful episodic drama of the restless, adventurous hero and his inevitable disillusionment, it is definitely a Babylonian, rather than Sumerian, development and achievement. In a very deep sense, therefore, the Epic of Gilgameš may be truly described as a Semitic creation.[46]

Kramer had stressed, as we noted, that the persuasiveness of his study lay in the actual availability of the earlier sources so that it was unnecessary to rely solely on critical analysis in investigating the epic's literary prehistory. In this respect we may consider Kramer's study representative of an "empirical" approach to literary history and contrast it with the "theoretical" approach which 19th century critical analysis, typified by Jastrow's study, was forced, in the absence of documentary evidence, to follow. Since Biblical literary criticism has not been able to advance beyond the theoretical approach, and probably never will[47] (except in relation to extrabiblical versions of a motif[48] or genre[49]), it will be of some interest to see to what extent the theoretical approach has been confirmed by the empirical approach. And indeed, Kramer's study does in part vindicate the former approach. Of the three elements (nos. 2-4 , above) Jastrow held to be originally unrelated to Gilgamesh, Kramer confirmed that Utnapishtim's narrative (part of no. 3) and the 12th tablet (no. 4)[50] were indeed originally independent. Kramer could only speculate on the ultimate origin of the chain of events culminating in Gilgamesh and Enkidu's friendship, which partially overlaps with Jastrow's "Story of Enkidu, the hierodule and the hunter" (no. 2), but we shall offer further evidence for their independent origin below, Ch. IV-VI. Even the compositeness of GE XI has been supported more recently by Laessøe on the basis of what appears to be one of its sources, Atrahasis III.[51] Not every one of Jastrow's suggestions has been confirmed--

no further evidence has developed for a separate epic of Enkidu (see below, Ch. VI); neither, however, has any of his basic suggestions been disproved. In a general sense Kramer's view that The Death of Gilgamesh was a source of the 'quest for immortality' episode of the epic (GE IX-XI) might by implication contradict part of Jastrow's third "non-Gilgamesh" element, "the story of Gilgamesh's wanderings [in quest of immortality]." This was, however, the least convincing part of Kramer's argument and when a few years later Kramer's article was summarized by Ranke he considered The Death of Gilgamesh to be one of the two Sumerian compositions (the other is Gilgamesh and Agga) which "remain of no significance for the Babylonian Gilgamesh Epic."[52]

B. The Origin of the Integrated Epic

One important point on which Kramer's evidence was not yet unequivocal was the independence of the Sumerian episodes from each other (question a). Kramer held open the possibility that Gilgamesh and the Land of the Living and The Death of Gilgamesh were parts of the same episode, but we have already noted that this position must be abandoned. But what is the evidence against some of the episodes having been joined in an epic sequence? Kramer pointed only to the fact that "the Sumerian poems vary considerably in length, and consist of individual, disconnected tales."[53] The latter point of course begs the question, while the former, the variation in length, is of no significance when one considers that even in the canonical version of the epic, the cedar mountain episode covers three tablets (III-V) while the Bull of Heaven episode covers only one (VI). Further evidence for the non-integration of the Sumerian episodes was clearly needed.

Some evidence for this was adduced by L. Matouš in 1958.[54] He pointed to the mythological introductions, referring back to creation, of Gilgamesh, Enkidu, and the Netherworld and of the flood story, as evidence that these compositions were not the sequels of some earlier episodes, since such descriptions of creation are typically at the beginnings of the compositions in which they appear.[55] The unique character of Gilgamesh and Agga attested its independence of the other Gilgamesh material. Furthermore, the first and third of these, along with Gilgamesh and the Land of the Living, are listed by title in a Sumerian literary catalogue,[56] thus confirming their independence of episodes which might have preceded them.[57] In sum, four compositions--Gilgamesh and the Land of the Living, Gilgamesh, Enkidu and the Netherworld, the Flood, and Gilgamesh and Agga--were clearly independent of any preceding episodes, so that only the remaining texts--Gilgamesh and the Bull of Heaven and the two fragments of The Death of Gilgamesh could possibly have formed the sequel to some other text. Matouš argued at length, on the analogy of the sequence of events in the Akkadian epic and on the basis of some epithets of Gilgamesh which appear in both

XUM

compositions, that Gilgamesh and the Land of the Living was indeed followed by Gilgamesh and the Bull of Heaven, and that these two were followed, possibly by The Death of Gilgamesh fragment A, and probably by The Death of Gilgamesh fragment B which allegedly really described offerings by Gilgamesh on the death of Enkidu;[58] this Sumerian "Gilgamesh Epic" was the germ of the later Akkadian GE; however, Matouš acknowledged, when he published this argument in 1960,[59] that the rug had been pulled from under him by the publication in the meantime of the end of Gilgamesh and the Land of the Living.[60] The possibility remains that Gilgamesh and the Bull of Heaven and the Death of Gilgamesh fragments[61] may someday be combined with each other or some other text,[62] but there is no present evidence for doing so. In principle, Kramer's claim of the independence of the Sumerian episodes is largely confirmed.[63]

Beyond the level of the individual composition it would be interesting to know whether the Sumerian scribes conceived of these as forming a Gilgamesh cycle.[64] Sumerian literary catalogues which list Gilgamesh compositions in succession or near each other may have some such implication. This evidence cannot be dismissed as reflecting a self-understood method of classification, for the collocation of compositions dealing with the same character is not something always to be taken for granted in Sumerian

XUM

literary catalogues. For example, the catalogue UET VI/1, 123,[65] which does collocate a number of texts dealing with the same character(s),[66] nevertheless separates others: it lists Inanna and Ebiḫ as no. 13 but Inanna's descent as no. 27; two texts about Enlil are entered as numbers 16 and 51, while two Ninurta myths (nos. 41-42) are separated from the "Instructions of Ninurta" (no. 35). Clearly other criteria than the identity of the hero are operative in these cases,[67] so that the latter criterion should have some significance when it appears. This very catalogue lists two versions of Gilgamesh and the Land of the Living together (nos. 9-10)-showing, incidentally, that two versions of the same composition might be current in one place simultaneously-followed by a text entitled šul-mè-kam (no. 11) which Kramer guessed, on the basis of its position, may be a Gilgamesh text (though for us to use this argument would be circular reasoning), followed by Gilgamesh and Agga (no. 12). The same sequence is partially observable in catalogue P[68] where Gilgamesh and the Land of the Living version A (no. 10) is followed by šul-mè-ka (no. 11) and Gilgamesh and Agga (no. 12), then by an unidentifiable text (gud-dam-si-sá, no. 13),[69] followed by Gilgamesh and the Land of the Living version B (no. 14). In catalogue B[70] the two versions of Gilgamesh and the Land of the Living appear as nos. 14 and 16, separated by an unidentifiable text. On the other hand, catalogue L[71]

XUM

lists Gilgamesh and the Land of the Living version A as no. 10, but šul-me(sic)-ka and Gilgamesh and the Land of the Living version B as nos. 38 and 39. The catalogues list up to three different compositions with the incipit u_4-ri-a,[72] one of which is likely to be Gilgamesh, Enkidu, and the Nether World, which has this incipit;[73] all of these are separated from the other Gilgamesh incipits by two or more places. This fact may reflect, even in the Sumerian material, the anomalousness of this composition within the Gilgamesh tradition; on the other hand Kramer cautiously identified the entry as "probably the first complex of"[74] Gilgamesh, Enkidu, and the Nether World, rather than the entire composition, and since Shaffer has subsequently suggested that the three sections of this composition were originally independent of each other,[75] the incipit's position in the catalogues could reflect the period before the section dealing with Gilgamesh was combined with the first section. A full evaluation of this evidence will have to await study of the principles of arrangement of the catalogues.[76]

A further factor to be considered, uncertain though it be, is the end of line 118 of Gilgamesh and the Land of the Living, as read and interpreted by van Dijk:[77] ab-ba è-da?, "qui s'en va sur la mer." If this interpretation is correct--and van Dijk claims no certainty on this[78] --it implies at the very least an awareness on the part of the author of Gilgamesh and the Land of the Living of other adventures of Gilgamesh; and if, as seems natural, this crossing of the sea refers to Gilgamesh's journey to Utnapistim as narrated in GE X and its Old Babylonian counterpart,[79] one will have to consider the possibility that this Sumerian reference already presupposes the entire sequence of events which, in the Akkadian version, motivated that journey. Enlil's anger at Gilgamesh and Enkidu for killing Huwawa may also presuppose the ensuing death of Enkidu,[80] unless one agrees with van Dijk that Gilgamesh and the Land of the Living itself contains the punishment for that act.[81]

This leads us to the question of the status of the Gilgamesh literature in the Old Babylonian period. Do the Old Babylonian fragments constitute parts of an integrated epic, or simply isolated episodes as seems to be the case with the Sumerian compositions?

Our knowledge of the Old Babylonian Gilgamesh literature has been considerably augmented recently; the texts presently known to me are the following, arranged according to the place of their counterparts in the canonical version:

Corresponding to GE:	OB Text	Place of Publication
I, ii	2N-T79	Three lines transliterated by Shaffer, p. 23n, see below Ch. II, C.
I and II	Pennsylvania Tablet (abbreviated GEP)	Langdon, UM X/3; Jastrow-Clay, YOS IV, 3.
II and III	Yale Tablet (abbreviated GEY)	Jastrow-Clay, YOS IV/3.
V	(A) Harmal Fragment	van Dijk, Sumer 15, 9f., Pl. 3f.
	(B) Harmal	van Dijk, Sumer 13, 66 and 91.
	(C) Iščāli Fragment	Bauer, JNES 16, 254-62.
X	(A) Meissner Fragment (abbreviated GEM)	Meissner, MVAG VII.
	(B) Supplement to Meissner Fragment (abbreviated GEM Supp)	Millard, CT 46:16 and Iraq 26, 99-105.

One additional small Old Babylonian fragment from Nippur now at the University Museum in Philadelphia was called to my attention by E. Leichty. It contains an address by Gilgamesh to Enkidu.

That this material consituted an integrated epic already in the Old Babylonian period has often been assumed.[82] The uncertainty of this assumption was noted by D. O. Edzard in 1965,[83] and in 1969 by H. N. Wolff who attempted briefly to adduce some evidence which might overcome these doubts.[84]

She noted the use of a "week-long suspension" followed by a "change of the character and outlook of the person concerned" twice in the Old Babylonian version at strategic points in the narrative (GEP ii, 6ff.; GEM ii, 8ff.), as indicating "the work of an author pursuing a specific line of thought;" she concluded, however, that this evidence shows at most a single author and was in addition subjective.

For our question the important facts about the Old Babylonian material are: (1) 2N-T79 describes the creation of Enkidu to contend with Gilgamesh; (2) Enkidu is Gilgamesh's "friend" (ibru) throughout the Old Babylonian material (GEY ii, 40; iii, 14; iv, 5,26; v, 21f.,41?) Harmal B 3, 10; Iščāli obv. 14; rev. [1: raʾu] 5; GEM ii, 7; GEM Supp. iii, 4') and is "like" Gilgamesh (kima, GEP i, 17; mašil, v. 15); (3) GEM and GEM Supp. and its supplement narrate Gilgamesh's journey to Utnapishtim, and have that journey motivated by grief over Enkidu. Each of these facts makes sense only in the context of the unified epic.[85] As Dossin has noted

> the Epic of Gilgamesh presents a real unity of composition, and...that unity is assured for it as much, if not more, by the role given to Enkidu as by that of Gilgamesh.[86]

Gilgamesh's search for immortality is, as GEM and GEM Supp make clear, motivated by Enkidu's death;[87] but in order for Enkidu's death to have this effect on Gilgamesh, Enkidu should be more than a servant, and to this end the epic makes him a friend and equal.[88] It is true that even in the Sumerian Gilgamesh, Enkidu, and the Nether World Gilgamesh grieves over Enkidu's capture by the Nether World; he truly cares for Enkidu, servant though he is,[89] and tries to recover him; but there Gilgamesh's emotional response is not one of distraction, and does not issue in an attempt to escape death himself. Finally, it is only Enkidu's status as a friend and equal which creates a literary need to account for his origins. In sum, all those developments in the character and role of Enkidu which constitute the integrating factor in the epic are already present in the Old Babylonian version, which deserves thereby to be considered an epic.

Theoretically it is conceivable that some of these developments appeared in Sumerian forerunners which are unavailable to us. Kramer considered this possibility in a lengthy footnote[90] and concluded that it was highly unlikely, since the texts of Sumerian compositions had become standard by the early Old Babylonian period; one would therefore have to assume, if this possibility was to be preferred, that the epic was created no later than the Ur III period and that the redactor "consistently made use only of those versions which failed to become the standard text in the Isin-Larsa period," which is unlikely. Kramer's argument is convincing. For our purposes, however, even if he should be wrong, this would affect only the question of the period and the language in which the integrated epic was created, rather than the process whereby this was done.

It is the latter subject which is of greatest interest to literary criticism. Now that we have identified the elements which constitute the integrating factor in the epic, we can begin to view the role of the redactor with some clarity. It is he who transformed the separate episodes into an integrated whole with a new meaning. In the following chapters we shall examine more of his contributions - the epic's structure, its message, and new motifs which he was the first to introduce. He appears to have recast his source material into his own style. He is no mere anthologizer, nor even a harmonizer, but rather a creative adapter who thoroughly transformed his source material on every level.

A word ought to be said about the status of the Gilgamesh materials at Boghazköi. The Akkadian fragment KUB IV, 12[91] covers on its obverse part of the journey to the cedar mountain,[92] while its reverse contains part of the Bull of Heaven episode. These two episodes were therefore combined by the 14-13th century, the date of this fragment.[93] Whether this reflects an Old Babylonian or early Kassite period forerunner must await consideration of the larger question of the derivation of Akkadian literary texts found at Boghazköi.[94] Von Soden has characterized *KUB* IV, 12, on the basis of its text and implied tablet-division, as "pre-canonical."[95] If one could accept this characterization, it would then follow that *the combination of episodes is earlier than the canonical version*. But KUB IV, 12, could just as well be "non-canonical" as "pre-canonical."[96]

In the Hittite recension[97] a number of tablets likewise cover several episodes each. The first tablet of the Hittite recension covers in abbreviated form the material narrated in GE I-V. The events of GE VI (as well as III-V) are presupposed by *KUB* VIII, 48 + 49 and their partially overlapping duplicate *KUB* XVII, 3, which begin with Enkidu's dream in which the gods condemn him to death for his part in killing Huwawa and the Bull of Heaven; the tablet continues through Gilgamesh's mourning over Enkidu and his meeting with Siduri. These tablets clearly bespeak an integrated epic. The Hittite Gilgamesh fragments date to the 2nd half of the 14th century,[98] giving a *terminus ad quem* for the integration of the epic. Can one, however, argue that the Hittite recension goes directly back to an Old Babylonian *Vorlage*, and thus adduce it as an additional argument for an Old Babylonian *epic*? This is difficult to say since the derivation of the Hittite versions of Babylonian literature has not been studied in detail. Presumably the Hittites could have obtained copies of Old Babylonian texts when they sacked Babylon in 1595, much as Tukulti-Ninurta I (1244-1208) did later,[99] and translated them into Hittite. However it is often assumed that the Hittites received their versions of Akkadian myths from the Hurrians,[100] and A. Kammenhuber has adduced evidence in favor of this view for the Gilgamesh material; she holds that the material came to the Hittites c. 1400.[101] Now there are three Gilgamesh fragments in Hurrian, two presently published.[102] Each of these has a title inscribed on its left edge: one is "Fourth Tablet of Huwawa. Incomplete," the other: [?th tablet] of Gilgamesh. Incomplete."[103] This has led H. Otten and Kammenhuber to raise the possibility that the Hurrian Gilgamesh material still consisted of separate episodes,[104] although it has yet to be demonstrated that a single composition cannot be referred to by different titles.[105] Others have suggested that naming one episode after Huwawa simply reflects the Anatolian interest in an episode which, on the testimony of the Old Babylonian version[106] and the Hittite,[107] took place in nearby north Syria.[108] If this title does indeed reflect a separate episode, it will still have to be asked whether this constitutes evidence for an Old Babylonian forerunner, or rather a Sumerian one, or perhaps is of no significance beyond the Hurrians. The situation is rendered more complicated by the fact that the text entitled "Huwawa" *may* narrate the mortal illness of Enkidu and Gilgamesh's meeting with the ale-wife,[109] in which case it would have to be viewed as the title for the epic as a whole.[110] The same would be implied by the Hittite text *KUB* XXXIII 124, which belongs to the Uršanabi episode, if Otten is correct in reading the title [Huwaw]a,[111] against Laroche who reads it [GILGAMEŠ].[112] Whatever may be the case with the Hurrian fragments, it is impossible to believe that the Hittite scribes created a sequence of episodes indentical to that of the Akkadian epic independently of native Mesopotamian influence. The only question is the date of that influence. But whatever may be the answer regarding the Hittite material, the Old Babylonian version itself provides enough evidence to justify the conclusion that it already constituted an integrated epic.

C. *The framework*

The integrity of the eleven tablets which comprised the original canonical version of the epic is expressed by the literary framework[113] which envelops it (I, i, 1-19 or more; XI, 303-307). These passages deserve special attention, since their prominent position suggests the importance the final editor must have ascribed to their contents.

The introduction consists of three parts which are distinct on both chronological and thematic grounds:

XUM

(a) lines 1-8 give pride of place to Gilgamesh's experiences, culminating in his inscribing them on a stela; the events mentioned occurred at the end of his adventures; (b) lines 9f. refer to his building the walls of Uruk and the temple Eanna; this must have taken place before Gilgamesh's adventures, since the wall is already built when Gilgamesh returns to Uruk in XI, 303ff. (cf. also VI, 157f.); (c) lines 11ff. invite the audience[114] to behold these walls with wonder; it is these lines which are partially repeated at the end of XI.[115]

It is a commonplace that GE is about the hero's quest to overcome death.[116] This theme of Gilgamesh's life is mentioned in a collection of omens about Gilgamesh where he is said to have "sought for life like Ziusudra;"[117] the collection also mentions the defeat of Humbaba and the cutting of the cedar forest.[118] The latter adventure, the slaying of the Bull of Heaven, and other adventures like these are frequently mentioned by Gilgamesh himself in the course of lamenting Enkidu and searching for immortality (VIII, ii, 10-12; X, ii, 35-37, 39-42; etc.). Of all this the epic's introduction says nothing. The search for immortality is subtly passed over; in its place is mentioned the outcome of that search--the understanding that Gilgamesh gained. The importance of the latter theme is underlined by the frequency of the verbs "see" and "know," and the nouns "wisdom," "secret(s)" "hidden

XUM

thing(s)," in the opening section (a).[119] The great deeds which were traditionally regarded as the means of perpetuating one's name,[120] by which Gilgamesh himself had sought in the course of the epic to achieve this goal,[121] are ignored in favor of the wisdom he acquired. As Shaffer observed, "it is this latter aspect of Gilgamesh which the poet prizes over and above the heroic exploits that take up a good part of the epic."[122]

The culmination of this passage is Gilgamesh's inscribing "all his toil" on a stele (*narû*). The epic itself, with its third-person narrative, is not a piece of *narû* literature,[123] which, as the recently proposed designation "poetic autobiography"[124] indicates, typically consists of a first person narrative. But Oppenheim has suggested that the information narrated in the epic may have been understood to be derived from Gilgamesh's stele.[125] A close parallel to the lesson of his adventures (GEM iii; GE X, vi)[126] which Gilgamesh's stele-inscription would have contained is found in the Legend of Naram-Sin,[127] a *narû* inscription which also shows the role of such didactic inscriptions in perpetuating their author's name. Naram-Sin wrote this inscription to convey for his successors' benefit[128] the lessons of his own sad experience:

> 147. Whosoever thou art, whether governor or prince
> or any one else,
> 148. whom the god shall call to rule over a kingdom,

XUM

149. I have made for thee an ivory (?) tablet and
inscribed a stele for thee,
150. and in Cuthah, in E-meslam,
151. in the shrine of Nergal I have deposited it
for thee.
152. Read this document and
153. listen to the words thereof.
154. Be not bewildered, be not confused,
155. be not afraid, do not tremble,
156. stablish thyself firmly,
157. *enjoy thyself*[129] in the bosom of thy wife,
158. strengthen thy walls,
159. fill thy trenches with water,
160. thy chests, thy corn, thy money, thy goods
and thy possessions
161. bring into thy stronghold,
162. tie up thy weapons and get thee into a corner[130].
163. spare thy warriors and take heed for thy
person.
164. Though he wander through thy land, go not out
to him,
165. though he *slay* thy cattle, go not nigh him,
166. though he eat the flesh of thy......
167. though he ....
168. be meek, be hum[ble],
169. answer them (!) "Here am I, my lord,"
170. respond to their wickedness with kindness,
171. to kindness with gifts and *exchanges*,
172. but do not go forth before them.
173. Let wise scribes read aloud thy stele.
174. Thou who hast read my stele and *kept out of
trouble*,
175. thou who hast blessed me, may a future one
bless thee.[131]

Thus leaving such advice for posterity will, in addition to the normal function of a stele in perpetuating the author's name,[132] secure for the author the grateful blessing of future rulers who benefit from the advice. This is underlined by Naram-Sin's earlier statement[133] that the failure of Enme(r)kar to leave a similar inscription had cost him Naram-Sin's blessing, as a result of which Enmerkar and his family were not faring well in the Nether World. Gilgamesh's own stele, with its similar didactic content as reflected in the epic, would have had the same purpose. This is one way in which Gilgamesh hoped to achieve a kind of immortality.

Section (b) describes another, building the walls of Uruk. Royal building projects,[134] with their accompanying inscriptions, served to perpetuate the name of the builder. Note for example the statement of Takil-ilišu of Malgium (c. 1840):[135]

> (The temple) Enamtila...all around with a great mantle of baked brick I surrounded, and (thereby) I surely established the eternal name of my kingship (*[š]umam dariam*[136] *[š]a šarrutiya lu aškun*).[137]

In the additional fragments of the Death of Urnammu[138] recently published by C. Wilcke,[139] a promise is made to the dead Ur-Nammu that his name will be pronounced, that the speaker will summon Sumer and Akkad to Ur-Nammu's palace, show them the canals he dug, the fields and fortified settlements for which he had been responsible, and (thus) cause them to pronounce his name (forever?).[140] Whether the Sumerian Death of Gilgamesh, which may be of the same genre as the Death of Ur-Nammu,[141] ended with a similar promise cannot be determined, but certainly in GE we see the narrator doing for the dead Gilgamesh, in section (c) of the prologue, precisely what the speaker in the Death of Ur-Nammu promised that king: to perpetuate his name by showing his enduring achievements to later generations. If this rehearsal of the dead king's name and achievements

XUM

could be shown to demand a cultic context, such as the royal funerary cult in which mention of the names of the dead kings is a prominent feature,[142] this might constitute evidence for a cultic Sitz im Leben for the epic. On this more presently.

It is this third section which is partially repeated at the end of the epic (XI, 303 ff.). It has often been noted that the reference to the walls points to "the only work of the hero that promised, even guaranteed, his immortality."[143] In fact, Gilgamesh was remembered as the builder of the wall of Uruk in an inscription of AN-am, a later king of that city.[144] As a literary device the reversion to this theme at the end of the epic has a powerful effect. By having Gilgamesh's adventures end on the note with which they began,[145] the poet thus shows the futility of all the intervening efforts.[146] Moreover, by placing the words in the mouth of Gilgamesh himself upon his return to Uruk the poet shows us the change in Gilgamesh's own person.[147] He whose entire career consisted of attempts to overcome death in ever more unconventional ways, ultimately points with pride and acceptance to one of the most conventional ways - the way with which his career had begun and the rejection of which had first motivated his adventures.[148] To this is added the writing of a stele, the other conventional method.

Even at the beginning of his career Gilgamesh's efforts for perpetuating his name were extraordinary, if conventional. Thus the walls he constructed are such that none can equal them (I, i, 12, 15). He then turned to another standard method, performing a great deed;[149] other kings adopted this method--Shulgi, for example, claims to have run from Nippur to Ur and back in a single day "that my name be established unto distant days, that it leave not the mouth of men, that my praise be spread wide in the lands, that I be eulogized in all the lands"[150] --but Gilgamesh's deed was to be no ordinary "great deed": he would defeat the fearsome Huwawa, divinely-appointed guardian of the cedar forest, and thereby banish all evil from the land; so daring was this attempt that Gilgamesh's name would endure because of it even if he should fall (GEY iv, 13-15). (According to one translation this adventure was motivated in the Sumerian version by an explicit rejection of the kind of immortality offered by building achievements: Wilcke suggests, with reservations, that Gilgamesh and the Land of the Living, line 4 is to be translated: "Das kostbare Ziegelwerk 'Leben' hat noch niemand überragt."[151]) The moment of Gilgamesh's greatest glory - the triumphal procession through Uruk after the slaying of the Bull of Heaven - was followed at once by the dream portending Enkidu's death. Once the passing of his beloved friend Enkidu gave Gilgamesh a first-hand experience of death, a change took place in the ways in which he sought to transcend death. He would no longer be satisfied with the conventional methods, but sought instead unique ways of overcoming death literally. He first sought to learn the secret of immortality from Utnapištim, who with his wife was the only mortal previously to escape death; finally he sought to overcome death by a plant of rejuvenation.[152] When all this failed he returned to Uruk and accepted once again the conventional ways by which death can be only indirectly overcome, enduring building projects and didactic stele-inscriptions.[153] Thus the epic "exemplifies, through a single legendary figure, the various attitudes to death that humans tend to adopt..."[154]

The foregoing remarks may help to account for some of the epic's significant omissions. Two episodes of the Sumerian Gilgamesh material have no counterparts in the epic--"Gilgamesh and Agga" and the "Death of Gilgamesh." Kramer supposed the first to have been omitted in part because its characters were exclusively human.[155] Whether Gilgamesh or Agga won the wrestling match is debated,[156] but Gilgamesh's ultimate recognition of Agga's authority was hardly a heroic outcome and was not the sort of achievement likely to immortalize his name. The epic's omission of Gilgamesh's death[157] forces Gilgamesh to live with what he has learned, an apt conclusion for a text whose introduction gives that learning so prominent a place.[158] The epic's complete silence on Gilgamesh's role, of which the author must have been aware, as king of the Netherworld may reflect similar purposes, for its inclusion would have deprived Gilgamesh's resignation of its poignancy.

Regarding possible antecedents of the "rhapsodic description of [the] walls" Kramer concluded that since "in none of the Sumerian epic material known to date do we find a parallel stylistic feature" the introduction was a "Babylonian innovation."[159] In the absence of proof that such a stylistic feature was attested in Akkadian literature this conclusion was premature. Now several pieces of Sumerian literary evidence will require a modification of it: (a) Already available in 1944 was the composition "Gilgamesh and Agga," which contains something similar to the literary framework of GE. In the course of encouraging Gilgamesh to resist Agga, the assembly of the "men" of his city addresses Gilgamesh as follows:

> Erech, the handiwork of the gods,
> Eanna, the house descending from heaven--
> It is the great gods who have fashioned its parts--
> Its great wall touching the clouds,
> Its lofty dwelling place established by Anu,
> Thou hast cared for, thou who art king (and) hero,
> O thou...-headed, thou prince beloved of Anu...[160]

After the narrative has ended[161] this address is repeated in the section which gives the reason for which Gilgamesh's praises are sung, with the addition of two lines describing the outcome of the conflict. Like the framework of GE, then, a passage from the course of the narrative has been excerpted and placed in the narrator's mouth where it is used to sum up the theme of the composition; but here the order has been reversed, with the passage coming from early in the narrative and being quoted at the end. Although the first of the two parallel passages does not appear precisely at the beginning of the text, neither, in fact, is this the case in GE.

(b) Another of the epic compositions about a king of Uruk, the Lugalbanda Epic, ends with a "bewundernde Beschreibung"[162] of the city Aratta which is stylistically similar to Gilgamesh's description of Uruk to Urshanabi:

> Aratta's battlements are of green lapis lazuli,
> its walls (and) its towering brickwork shine red;
> their clay is "tin-stone,"
> it is nipped off from the mountain range of the
> *ḫašur*-cypresses.[163]

Whether this passage recapitulates one earlier in the epic depends on whether the Lugalbanda epic is in reality the second part of a longer epic, of which Lugalbanda and Hurrum-kurra is the first part,[164] if so, this passage may have its counterpart in the missing first part of the latter, which included a campaign against Aratta.[165]

(c) The passage from near the end of the "Death of Ur-Nammu" cited above presupposes just such a summons to behold the dead hero's works as we find in section (c) of the GE prologue.

(d) Similar rhapsodic descriptions occur in the Sumerian temple hymns published by Sjöberg and Bergmann and Gragg.[166] For example, Temple Hymn No. 10, describing the house of Asarluḫi in Kuar, begins:

> City, from/in the Abzu.......like grain,
> Plain (with) heavy clouds, taking the me's from
>   its midst,
> Kuar, to the foundation of your shrine
> The lord, who does not hold back his goods, goes
>   amazed,
> The Seven Wise Ones have enlarged it for you
>   everywhere?.[167]

The last line recalls one in GE I, i, 19: "Did not the Seven [Sages] lay its (=Uruk's) foundations?" The very temple which is mentioned in the introduction to GE, the Eanna of Inanna in Uruk, is the subject of Temple Hymn No. 16, which begins:

> House with the great me's of Kulaba, ...,
>   (its) ....has made the temple flourish,
> Well grown with fresh fruit, marvelous, filled
>   with ripeness,
> Descending from the midst of heaven, shrine,
>   built for? the steer,
> Eanna, house with seven corners, lifting the
>   'seven fires' at night,
> Surveying the seven.....
> .....[168]

The same epithet of the Eanna, "(house which) has descended from heaven," occurs, as Sjöberg noted,[169] in Gilgamesh and Agga line 31. The Keš Temple Hymn contains a parallel to the invitation in GE I, i, 11ff. to the listener to behold Uruk's walls:

> To the city, to the city, man, approach!
> To the Keš temple, to the city, man, approach!
> Its hero Aššir, man, approach!
> Its lady Nintu, man, approach!
> (Well-)constructed Keš, Aššir, praise!
> ...Keš, Nintu, praise![170]

In light of this material it will have to be granted that in style and content much of GE's framework can indeed be paralleled in Sumerian literature, including some compositions which relate to the Sumerian Gilgamesh cycle.

XUM

D. Literary classification

As with any work of literature scholars have sought to assign the Gilgamesh Epic to a literary genre. Its conventional modern title "the Gilgamesh Epic" reflects a distinction commonly made by Assyriologists between myths, in which divine characters predominate, and epics in which human characters predominate.[171] Other classification systems are possible; thus Gaster considers the Gilgamesh Epic a tale because there is no evidence for its cultic use, as against a myth, which is recited in the cult.[172]

The system of classification adopted depends upon one's purpose in making the classification. For philologists, who are interested in describing and comparing the ancient genres in their own historical context,[173] the ancients' own systems of classification can serve as a valuable guide. What can be said of the Gilgamesh Epic in this regard?

The Sumerian Gilgamesh compositions offer some evidence for their literary classification. Of the six Sumerian narrative compositions which relate to Gilgamesh,[174] the ends of five are preserved, and they all conclude with zà-mí (-zu dùg-ga-àm), "(your) praise (is good),"[175] the standard ending of hymns.[176] The same is often true of texts which we consider myths, and of other genres as as well.[177] We should not minimize the differences between the various genres which have this conclusion. The Sumerian texts themselves indicate that zà-mí may appear in different genres. For example, Dumuzi and Enkimdu concludes with the doxology "...O maid Inanna, thy praise is good (zà-mí-zu du$_{10}$-ga-àm)," and then adds "it is to be recited antiphonally" (bal-bal-e-dam, presumably = bal-bal-e-ed-àm),[178] the term translated "recite antiphonally" being the name of the genre bal-bal-e.[179] It is true that zà-mí is not used in these concluding doxologies as a generic classification in the manner of such generic names as adab, tigi, and the like. The standard formula for these is: adab/tigi DN-ak-àm, "it is an adab/tigi of the god so-and-so."[180] Nor do we find zà-mí as the name of a category in Sumerian literary catalogues, in the manner of the standard categories.[181] Hartmann argues, following Falkenstein, that the term zà-mí in fact indicated originally a type of musical accompaniment rather than a literary genre.[182] This argument appears to be based in part on the lexical equation $^{\text{giš}}$zà-mí = $^{\text{giš}}$*tanittu*,[183] on the basis of which it is assumed that zà-mí was originally the name of a musical instrument. But to assume that *tanittu* was originally the name of a musical instrument, which later came to mean "praise" in general, seems the very reverse of what must have been the case,[184] since the derivation of *tanittu* from the verb *naʾādu*, "praise," seems clear.[185] Even if one grants, however, that zà-mí originally referred to a type of

XUM

musical accompaniment, this is not mutually exclusive with generic significance: such undisputed generic titles as adab and tigi are also at bottom the names of musical instruments; Hartmann lists za-mi with these as generic names derived from musical instruments, and holds that the term ultimately gained a more general generic meaning of "praise" (Lobpreis),[186] so we may consider the compositions ending za-mi to comprise, as it were, a broad "supercategory."

Nor should we minimize the differences between the Gilgamesh (and other) narratives and hymns in the strict sense. The latter are often typified by strings of epithets and cliches hardly comparable to the narrative compositions we are considering. Nevertheless the royal hymns often contain a good deal of narrative content,[187] and it is to these hymns in particular that we will compare the Gilgamesh texts below. We actually have the text of a short hymn, in the stricter sense, to Gilgamesh.[188] It lists "some of the deeds for which [Gilgamesh] was famous in Sumerian history and literature,"[189] including a victory over Enmebaragesi of Kiš, recalling the composition Gilgamesh and Agga, which describes Gilgamesh's confrontation with Enmebaragesi's son. The hymn is recited to Gilgamesh by Shulgi who "praises him in his might (nam-kala-ga-na mu-ni-in-i-i) (and) calls upon him

XUM

in his heroism (nam-ur-sag-gá-na mu-ni-in-pà-pà-dè),"[190] The terms "might" and "heroism" may refer to nothing more than Gilgamesh's personal qualities here, but it is worth noting that "heroism" (nam-ur-sag) also appears in the name of a type of royal hymn, šir-nam-ur-sag-gá[191] so that it could conceivably have generic significance here. The text offers no information on its *Sitz im Leben*. Jacobsen speculated that "it may have referred to the introduction of the cult of Gilgamesh into the temple-complex or - more likely - to a visit by ŠULgi(r) to Gilgamesh already installed in that temple."[192]

The grouping of epics, myths, and hymns into a single category, hymn, also appears in Akkadian literature, where, for example, the Atrahasis Epic, the Erra Epic, and Enuma Elish are all called *zamāru*, "song, hymn."[193] This category may seem too heterogeneous to suit modern tastes, but its functionality in the ancient context is attested by the fact that in Akkadian all three genres shared a single literary dialect, the so-called "Hymnic-Epic" dialect.[194] However, it remains to be determined whether in this sense *zamāru* means anything more than "poem."

There is no direct evidence for the *Sitz im Leben* of the Sumerian Gilgamesh compositions. Kramer assumed that if they were recited at all, it is likely to have been "in the palaces on the occasion of royal feasts and banquets."[195] But what are we to make of their hymnic

XUM

endings? It is worth comparing to these "epics" another type of Sumerian composition, with the same hymnic ending, which deals with episodes in its subjects' lives, namely the royal hymns. Hallo has noted that these hymns "add up to a kind of hymnic biography of the monarch."[196] There are two types of royal hymns; one, replete with liturgical notations, was obviously at home in the temple cult; the other, in which such notations are lacking, was "probably at home in the courtly ceremonial rather than the temple cult."[197] It is plausible that the epic "hymns" are the counterparts for long-dead royal heroes of the second type of royal hymn.[198] It is the latter type, by the way, which contains the concluding doxology with zà-mí.[199] The similarity in content and possibly structure between The Death of Gilgamesh and The Death of Ur-Nammu recently noted by Wilcke,[200] seems to imply just such a similarity, at least for one type of text.

Now we know that offerings were made to Gilgamesh in several Sumerian towns during the Ur III period.[201] The same is true for Early Dynastic Lagash, and Gilgamesh is included in a list of gods from Early Dynastic Fara. Personal names with Gilgamesh as the theophoric element appear as early as the Akkad period (in a seal inscription from Ur), and are frequent in the Ur III period. In the available documentation it is the kings

XUM

of Ur III especially[202] who stressed their ties with Uruk and its first dynasty. Both Ur-Nammu and Shulgi in several texts refer to Gilgamesh as their brother and Ninsun as their mother, Shulgi also referring to Lugalbanda as his father.[203] Whatever the Ur III kings' motives for stressing these ties,[204] their interest was ample, and several scholars have concluded on these and other grounds that the cycle of epics dealing with the kings of Uruk's first dynasty was composed or at least given its present form in the Ur III period.[205] What we would like to know, however, is the use to which these "hymns" were put, and it seems plausible to connect the Gilgamesh "hymns" with the cult of Gilgamesh carried on in that period. The absence of liturgical notations in these "hymns" would seem to argue, as in the case of the royal hymns of this type, against a connection with the temple; more precision on this will have to await better understanding of the nature of the Gilgamesh cult in Ur III.

Some later texts must be considered in this connection. A letter to a Neo-Assyrian king (*ABL* 56) contains the following instructions:

(obv. 7-8) *šá nu-bat-te* ⸢*ma*⸣-*ag-lu-u šarru e-pa-aš*

(9-rev. 1) *ina ṣip-par-ra-a-te ri-iḫ-te* [...*dul*?]-⸢*li*?⸣ *šarru e-pa-aš*

(rev. 2-4) *u* ([*a-na*]?) *ne-pe*-⸢*i*⸣-[*še*] $^{\text{ITU}}$*Abi šá* x[.....] *in-ni-pa-šú*-⸢*u-ni*⸣

(5-6) *ṣalam* ^{d}*Gilgameš* ⸢*ib*⸣*-ba-aš-ši ina lìb-bi il-lak*

> At evening the king will perform the *maqlû*-ceremony
> In the morning the king will perform the remainder [of the ritual(?)]
> And ([for]?) the rites of the month Ab which/of [...] are to be performed.
> There will be a statue of Gilgamesh; it will serve in (these ceremonies).[206]

The connection with a *maqlû* ceremony recalls the mention of Gilgamesh in *Maqlû* I, 37f.,[207] and a statue of Gilgamesh is implied in other late texts.[208] Ceremonies connected with Gilgamesh in the month of Ab are also mentioned in "Astrolabe B," which describes this month in part as follows:[209]

5....guruš gešpú-lirum-ma	13 *araḫ* ^{d}GIŠ.TU.BAR *tu-šu-ʾ-ú*
6 itu ^{d}Giš-bil-ga-meš ká-ne-ne	14 *ûmi*^{mi} *eṭ-lu-tu ina bābāni*^{MEŠ}*-šu-nu*
7 u$_4$-9-kam a-da-man	15 *u-ma-áš u-ba-ri ul-te-ṣu-ú*

> Month of Gilgamesh. For 9 days young men contest in wrestling and athletics in their city quarters.[210]

That this text relates to an early practice is suggested by a passage in The Death of Gilgamesh which, in spite of numerous difficulties, displays several striking similarities with it, mentioning athletics and the month of Ab in connection with Gilgamesh:[211]

> *alan-bi u*$_4$*-ul-li-a-šè a-ba-da-an-dím-e*(!?)
> *šul*(!)*-kalag igi-du*$_8$ *u*$_4$*-sakar*$_x^{a}$ *-gim zag-du*$_8$

ḫu-mu-ta-an-ag-eš

igi-bi-a gešpú lirum-ma si a-ba-da-ab-sá

itu-NE-NE-GAR ezen(?)-gidim(?)-ma-ke$_4$-NE

Tentative translation:

When[b] their/his image has been made unto eternity,

Mighty youth(s), observing, like the new moon will
verily make (lit. do, =jump?) the threshold.

When before them/him wrestling and athletics are
conducted,

In the month of Ab, the festival (?) of the spirits(?),

.....

NOTES

a. For SAR = sakar$_x$ see J. Cooper, *Iraq* 32, 60:16 and 67 *sub* 16.

b. Taking a as the prospective preformative (ù > a before ba, Falkenstein, *Das Sumerische*, p. 50, §34.4eα).

Apparently Gilgamesh's dream or vision is now being reviewed by an interpreter who then adds the interpretation of the dream. Gilgamesh saw in this dream what appear to be at least in part memorial ceremonies, which are interpreted to forebode his death: an image (of him?) will be made, which will last forever;[212] some other obscure ceremonies will be performed; wrestling and athletics will be conducted (in his memory) in Ab, the "month of spirits (?)." Athletic activities in the cult are attested elsewhere in honor of Ninurta and an unidentified goddess,[213] but for a connection with memorial rites one would have to resort to classical parallels;[214] perhaps we should simply take them as one form of cultic activity, not necessarily memorial. At any rate it would appear to be the ceremonies mentioned in the Astrolabe and *ABL* 56 which Gilgamesh's vision foreshadowed. Possibly during these nine days of ceremonials some text (i.e. "hymn") about Gilgamesh was read--perhaps the Death of Gilgamesh, as the aetiology of the ceremony; or perhaps some rehearsal of his achievements such as that found at the end of The Death of Ur-Nammu.

When seeking comparable evidence for the *Sitz im Leben* of the Akkadian epic we do not have such helpful hints as the hymnic doxology and characterization of the text as a *zamāru*. In view of the widespread use of the latter term for "myths" and "epics," it seems likely that the Gilgamesh Epic, too, was so considered, and this would justify our speaking of the "Song of Gilgamesh" rather than the "Epic of Gilgamesh," just as the well-known Hittite text was entitled ŠIR ^{d}Ullikummi, "The Song of Ullikummi."[215] Some evidence of this classification may be present in the second half of the epic's incipit, if the missing word is really a first-person precative verb in the semantic range of "proclaim, make-known, praise," or the like,[216] for this is a standard type of incipit in Akkadian hymns.[217] Whether the epic was used as a hymn is difficult to say. The reference to a statue of Gilgamesh in *ABL* 56 rev. 5 implies that he was still

XUM

worshipped in the Neo-Assyrian period, and the use of a hymn in that context is plausible. The Astrolabe passage referring to ceremonies in honor of (?) Gilgamesh may also imply the usage of some text concerning Gilgamesh. But what may be implied is not necessarily the epic. The evidence presently available is far from sufficient for any conclusions.

NOTES TO Ch. I

1. Kramer, *History Begins at Sumer*, 180f.

2. Goetze and Levy, ^{c}*Atiqot* 2, 121-128 and pl. XVIII.

3. See Landsberger and Kupper and Otten in *GSL*, 31-36, 97-102; 139-143; Falkenstein, *CRRAI* 2 (1951), 12-27; Kammenhuber, ref. below, n. 97.

4. Von Soden, *MDOG* 85, 23; *ZA* 40, 187; 41, 129f.; Lambert, *JCS* 11, 1-14; Böhl, *Het Gilgamesj-Epos*^{2}, 16; cf. Hallo, *IEJ* 12, 15f. Landsberger dates GE about 1250, Matouš about 1100 (*GSL*, 34, 93f.). According to Stamm, *As. Stud.* 6, 13 n. 9a, Böhl finds the canonical version's *terminus ad quem* in the reign of Tiglath-Pileser I (1112-1074 according to Stamm [1115-1077 according to Brinkman *apud* Oppenheim, *AM*, 346]), to whose library Böhl believes the canonical Aššur fragment *KAR* 115 to belong. However Thompson, *GETh*, 7, and Frankena, *GSL*, 114, date the fragment to the ninth or eighth century.

5. Lambert, *JCS* 11, 11:K9717, rev. 11; *JCS* 16, 66:VI,10.

6. *JCS* 11, 1-9; cf. *JCS* 16, 77.

7. Van Dijk, *UVB* 18, 44:12.

8. Lambert, *JCS* 16, 76f; Shaffer, 3 n. 1; Böhl, *Het Gilgamesj-Epos*^{2}, 100.

9. See n. 8 and also Landsberger, *GSL*, 34; Hallo, *IEJ* 12, 15f.

10. *JAOS* 64, 7-23,83.

11. Ranke, *ZANF* 49, 45-49; Heidel, *GE*^{2}, 13f; Speiser, *ANET*, 73a; Laessøe, *Pedersen AV*, 211; Böhl, *MVEOL* 7, 145-177; *Het Gilgamesj-Epos*^{2}, 97f.; Landsberger, *GSL*, 32; Matouš, *GSL*, 83-94.

12. *BASOR* 94, 3 n. 2; cf. Hallo, *IEJ* 12, 14.

13. *The Religion of Babylonia and Assyria* (abbrev. *RBA*, ch. 23; cf. *AJSL* 15, 193-214; cf. Barton, *AJSL* 10,14; 15,246.

14. *RBA*, 514f.

15. *Ibid.*

16. Cf. *YOR* 4/3, 39-47 and *AJSL* 15, 193-214.

17. *RBA*, 514f.; cf. Gressmann-Ungnad, *Das Gilgamesch-Epos*, 190.

18. Ibid., 493f.; see Jastrow, *ZA* 13, 288-301 and cf. Poebel, *PBS* IV/1, 51 n. 2 and Laessøe, *Bi*. *Or*. 13, 90-102.

19. Cf. Jastrow, *YOR* 4/3, 51; Gressmann-Ungnad, *op*. *cit*., 231; Oppenheim, *AM*, 262.

20. *RBA*, 494.

21. *Ibid*., 513.

22. *AJSL* 15, 198.

23. *YOR* 4/3, 32-55.

24. *OLZ* 1921, 268?

25. *GETh*, 7f.

26. *Or*. 17, 17-58 *passim*.

27. For a seventh see now *UET* 6/1, no. 60.

28. *JCS* 1, 4.

29. Kramer, *AS* 10; now fully edited by A. Shaffer, *Sumerian Sources of Tablet XII of the Epic of Gilgameš* (unpubl. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, 1963).

30. *JAOS* 64, 14f.

31. *RA* 34,97.

32. Cf. the first-person narration in the Ras Shamra fragment, Lambert-Millard, *Atrahasis* 132f.: 6-10.

33. *JAOS* 64, 15f.

34. *Ibid*., 16 n. 2, 18 n. 82; *BASOR* 94, 3 n. 4; *ANET*, 50 n. 1.

35. *JCS* 1, 4 n. 2.

36. Van Dijk, *GSL*, 69-81.

37. Cf. already Matouš, *GSL*, 85-87.

38. *JAOS* 64, 16f.; cf. Matouš, *GSL*, 90.

39. *JAOS* 64, 17f. It was later pointed out, however, that Gilgamesh's consultation with the elders of Uruk does provide a counterpart to that theme in GEP v and vi and GE III, i, which is absent in Gilgamesh and the Land of the Living (Böhl, *MVEOL* 7, 170).

40. *JAOS* 64,22.

41. *Ibid.*, 23 n. 118.

42. *Ibid.*, 18. Langdon had claimed earlier that the Sumerian material already constituted an epic (*JRAS* 1932,912).

43. *JAOS* 64, 14 n. 49; for some exceptions in Gilgamesh, Enkidu, and the Nether World see Shaffer, 22.

44. For some further sources of the epic cf. Heidel, *GE*^{2} (a borrowing from "Ishtar's Descent" in GE VII) and possibly Gadd, *Iraq* 28, 118-121 and van Dijk in S. Hartman (ed.), *Syncretism*, 176 (on the "things of stone motif" in GEM and GE X possibly being related to Gilgamesh, Enkidu, and the Nether World and other myths).

45. *JAOS* 64, 19.

46. *Ibid*. For the same phenomenon of creative adaptation in Biblical *vis-à-vis* ancient Near Eastern literature, cf. N. Sarna, *Understanding Genesis*, *passim*.

47. Cf. Hallo, *IEJ* 12, 13.

48. Documentation of this phenomenon is barely necessary. Among examples which remain fairly close to their ancient Near Eastern prototypes we may mention the flood story with its Mesopotamian prototypes and the second part of Ps. 104 and Prv. 22:17-24:22 with their Egyptian prototypes (*ANET*, 370f. and 421-424, respectively). As recently stressed by S. Loewenstamm, *The Tradition of the Exodus in its Development* [Hebrew; 1965], apocryphal, pseudepigraphical, Hellenistic, and midrashic sources can often be used in the same way (cf. the comment of N. Sarna, *JBL* 85 [1966], 244).

49. For a recent example cf. Weinfeld's dating of the covenant form of Deuteronomy on the basis of the different forms current in the second and first millennia (*JBL* 86 [1967], 255 n. 34) and Paul's study of the prologue and epilogue of the Covenant Code by comparison with the same phenomenon in cuneiform law corpora, *Studies in the Book of the*

Covenant in the Light of Cuneiform and Biblical Law, 11-42.

50. *The Greatness*...371. But this conclusion was not accepted by Oppenheim, *Or*. 17, 20; Dossin, *Bull. Academie Royale de Belgique* 42, 587f.; cf. the earlier explanation of Jensen, *Das Gilgamesch Epos in der Weltliteratur* I, 50f.

51. *Bi*. *Or*. 13.

52. *ZA* 49, 46 n. 1. However Shamash's statement in GEM i, 8 may be related to Death of Gilgamesh A, 35; see Matouš, GSL, 90.

53. *JAOS* 64,18.

54. Published in 1960 in *GSL*, 87f.

55. See Castellino, *VTS* 4, 117f. for a list of texts, and cf. the comment of Speiser, *Genesis*, LVII.

56. Kramer, *BASOR* 88, 10-19. See now the additional catalogue entries cited below.

57. However Wilcke, *Lugalbandaepos* 8, challenges this type of argument.

58. *GSL*, 88-90.

59. *GSL*, 89 n. 3.

60. Van Dijk, *TLB* II,4 and *GSL*, 69-81.

61. Cf. now Kramer, *GSL*, 67f.

62. Cf. above, n. 27.

63. Böhl's suggestion for combining Gilgamesh, Enkidu, and the Nether World and Death of Gilgamesh B (cited by Matous, *GSL*, 88) is apparently ruled out by Shaffer's edition of the former, in which the last line (303) ends with zà-mí (Shaffer, 95), but in view of the fluidity of the textual tradition of Gilgamesh, Enkidu, and the Nether World until a late date (ibid., 38) certainty on this score is not possible.

64. Cf. the possibility of a Lugalbanda cycle discussed by Wilcke, *Lugalbandaepos*, 5-8; cf. also M. Lambert, *RA* 55, 181.

XUM

65. Kramer, *RA* 55, 169-176.

66. Nos. 1-2 (Nisaba), 41-42 (Ninurta), 44-45 (the city of Ur) 16-17 (Enlil); cf. also 26 (Death of Dumuzi) and 27 (Inanna's Descent) - but in the reverse order of what we would expect; other compositions are grouped together by genre.

67. Cf. Kramer, *BASOR* 88, 19 with nn. 45f.; *RA* 55, 170 n. 5 for a discussion of various principles of arrangement apparently followed in the catalogues.

68. *BASOR* 88, 15.

69. Cf. Kramer, *ibid.*, n. 11. However this is not the incipit of the text to which he refers. According to Goetze this incipit may appear, poorly preserved, on YBC 9860, a hymn to ^{d}Kù-BU(=sù?).

70. *UET* 5, 86; Bernhardt-Kramer, *WZJ* 6, 394 n. 4.

71. *BASOR* 88, 17-19.

72. *BASOR* 88,15:7,20,21; 17f.: 7,14,15; *WZJ* 6, 389:6; *RA* 55, 171:29, see Kramer, *ibid.*, 175.

73. Kramer, *GSL*, 66.

74. *BASOR* 88, 15 n. 7.

75. Shaffer, 44.

76. Cf. M. Lambert, *RA* 55, 179f.

77. *GSL*, 71 and 74.

78. *Ibid.*, 79; the uncertainty of this reading is underscored by Shaffer's refraining from transliterating the end of the line in his unpublished MS of the text. If van Dijk is correct cf. also Death of Gilgamesh A (*BASOR* 94,7):10.

79. GEM and its supplement published by Millard, *Iraq* 26, 99-105.

80. Cf. the reasoning of Bauer with regard to the Iščāli fragment, *JNES* 16, 261f.

81. *GSL*, 81. Contrast Kramer's rendering of the curse, *GSL*, 65.

82. E.g., Heidel, *GE*^{2}, 15; Jacobsen in H. & H. A. Frankfort (eds.), *Before Philosophy*, 223; Speiser, *ANET*,

XUM

73; Bauer, *JNES* 16, 261; Landsberger, *GSL*, 33f.; Kupper, *ibid.*, 102; Saggs, *The Greatness*...370; Stamm, *As. Stud.* 6,12.

83. Edzard in Haussig, *WbM*, 72; Gadd, *Teachers and Students*..., 7f.

84. *JAOS* 89, 393 n. 2.

85. Cf. also Bauer, *JNES* 16, 261f.

86. *Academie Royale de Belgique: Bulletin de la Classe des Lettres...5^{e} Serie*, 42, 588; cf. Shaffer, 19, 21-25.

87. Cf. Oppenheim, *AM*, 260ff.

88. Cf. Kramer, *JAOS* 64, 19; Shaffer, 25; G. S. Kirk, *Myth*...,144.

89. Cf. Shaffer, 22f.; servant needn't mean menial here - cf. Falkenstein, *CRRAI* 2, 20.

90. *JAOS* 64, 16 n. 60.

91. Thompson, *GETh*, 43f., 79f., 81f.

92. *ANET*, 82d.

93. Otten, *GSL*, 139; cf. Landsberger-Tadmor, *IEJ* 14, 215.

94. See Oppenheim, quoted in introduction n. 113.

95. *MDOG* 85,22.

96. Cf. Kupper, *GSL*, 99f.

97. J. Friedrich, *ZANF* 5, 1-82; H. Otten, *Istanbuler Mitteilungen* 8, 93-125; E. Laroche, *RHA* 82,7-24; A. Kammenhuber, *Münchner Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 21 (1967), 45-58.

98. Kammenhuber, 46.

99. Lambert, *AfO* 18, 44:2ff.

100. E.g., H. G. Güterbock in S. N. Kramer (ed.), *Mythologies of the Ancient World*, 154; Otten, *GSL*,139; see the next note.

101. *Op. cit.*, 46,55.

102. *Op. cit.*, 47f.

103. *Op. cit.*, 47f.

104. Kammenhuber, *op. cit.*, 47; Otten, *GSL*, 140.

105. Variation of "title" and incipit is common, as in GE itself (ÉŠ.GÀR ^{d}*Gilgameš* vs. *ša nagba imuru*), Erra (ÉŠ.GÀR ^{d}*Erra* vs. *šar gimir dadmē*), and the Laws of Hammurapi (*īnu Anum ṣīrum* vs. *ṣimdat* or *dināni ša Ḫammurapi*; however see Finkelstein, *JCS* 21, 42, on the significance of this particular variation); but this is admittedly not the same thing as naming the same epic after two different heroes - antagonists at that!

106. Iščāli frag., rev. 13.

107. *Ist. Mit.* 8, 109:2' mentions the Euphrates on their journey; cf. *ibid*. p. 122f. and Iščāli frag. 1. *a*. Notwithstanding the views of the OB and Hittite versions, the episode may have been conceived in the Sumerian version to have taken place in the mountains east of Mesopotamia (Kinnier Wilson in *JSS* 7, 174). Bauer, on the other had held that the Sumerian version thought only of an unspecified mythological land (*JNES* 16, 260; cf. Lambert, *BWL*, 12).

108. E. von Schuler, in Haussig, *WbM* 165; cf. Ungnad, *ZANF* 35, 138.

109. According to von Schuler, *WbM* 165; Otten, *GSL*, 141. However, this is not the view of Kammenhuber, *op. cit.*, 47. But if Kammenhuber is correct in suggesting divine criticism of Gilgamesh and Enkidu for killing Huwawa, this may presuppose a sequel in which Enkidu dies - see above, text above n. 80.

110. Cf. Ungnad, *ZA* 35, 138.

111. *GSL*, 140.

112. *RHA* 82, 20.

113. Cf. L. Liebreich, *HUCA* 27, 190-192; *JQR* 47, 128-138.

114. Cf. Oppenheim, *AM*, 259 on the possibility that the audience addressed was a reading audience, as against his earlier remarks in *Or*. 17, 17-20. But the passage from the Death of Ur Nammu about to be cited may support the earlier view of an oral address inviting the audience to behold the deceased king's works.

115. Cf. the paean of praise to Jerusalem and her fortifications in Ps. 48, where v. 14b may even reflect the enduring name such fortifications were expected to secure for their builder in Mesopotamian ideology (see below).

116. Cf. Kramer, *JAOS* 64,8; Heidel, *GE*^{2}, 5; Speiser, *ANET*, 72; Oppenheim, *AM*, 257; Jacobsen in H. and H. A. Frankfort (eds.), *Before Philosophy*, 223-227; Lambert, *BWL*, 11f.

117. Lambert in *GSL*, 44f.

118. *Ibid*.

119. Oppenheim, *Or*. 17,18; cf. also Borger, *Bi*. *Or*. 14, 192b for a suggestion that *naqba* in the opening line also refers to "deep wisdom." For the wisdom involved in "bringing back a report of before the flood" cf. Assurbanipal's claim to have read inscriptions from before the flood, quoted by Lambert-Millard, *Atrahasis*, 27.

120. F. R. Kraus, *JNES* 19, 128-131.

121. *GEP* iv,v.

122. Shaffer, 20.

123. On which see Güterbock, *ZA* 42, 19-21, 62-86; O. R. Gurney, *An*. *St*. 5 (1955), 93.

124. Grayson and Lambert, "Akkadian Prophecies," *JCS* 18 (1964), 8; cf. Hallo's reservations about the term "*narû*-literature" in *HUCA* 33 (1962), 2 n. 18 and 9 n. 63.

125. Oppenheim, *AM*, 258.

126. Compare to GEM iii, 13 Naram-Sin Legend (see next note) 157 (to the problematic *šipir* cf. GEM iii, 14), on which see Hoffner, *JCS* 23 (1970), 18f.

127. Gurney, *An*. *St*. 5, 93-113; 6, 163f.

128. For other texts written for posterity cf. *CADE*, 420f.; Leichty, *Oppenheim AV*, 153.

129. Hoffner, *JCS* 23, 18f.

130. *Ibid*., 119.

131. Gurney, *An*. *St*. 5, 106-109; 6, 163f., with modifications by Hoffner, *JCS* 23, 18-20.

132. Kraus, *JNES* 19, 128-131; S. Dean McBride, *The Deuteronomic Name Theology*, unpubl. Harvard Ph.D. thesis (1969), ch. 2; R. S. Ellis, *YNER* 2; 166f.

133. Lines 23-30; cf. Gurney's comment, *An. St.* 5, 109 *sub* 27.

134. For the limitation of inscriptions and building deposits to temples and royal and public buildings see Ellis, *op. cit.*, 163f.

135. Jacobsen, *AfO* 12, 363-366.

136. *AfO* 12, 364f.: 12-21.

137. The concept of "an eternal name" is discussed in detail by McBride, ch. 2, where this passage is cited (93); cf. Kraus, *JNES* 19, 128-131.

138. Kramer, *JCS* 21, 104-122.

139. *Actes de la 17e RAI*, 81-92.

140. *Ibid.*, 90f.: 221-230.

141. Ibid., 82,84.

142. J. J. Finkelstein, *JCS* 20, 114-116; McBride, 152.

143. Oppenheim, *AM.*, 257; Ellis, *YNER* 2, 167 n. 27; McBride, 150 n. 67.

144. Below, ch. IV, A.

145. Cf. also the Hittite version's statement after the creation of Gilgamesh "All lands he roams...he comes to Uruk" (Otten, *Ist. Mit.* 8,98f.: 10f.), which could as well describe the second half and end of GE.

146. Oppenheim, *AM*, 257. For the futility of the recurring and cyclical cf. Eccl. 1:9.

147. Cf. Böhl, *Het Gilgamesj Epos*, 148f.; Stamm, *As.St.*6, 21.

148. To claim that in this way the poet "betrayed" his character (Wolff, *JAOS* 89,393) can only come from the imposition of alien categories of the "heroic" upon the epic.

149. Kraus, *JNES* 19, 128-131.

150. *ANET*, 585:36f.

XUM

151. *Actes de la* 17^{e} *RAI*, 91. Contrast, however, van Dijk in *GSL*, 79 bottom; Shaffer, 154 *sub* 298.

152. Oppenheim, *Or*. 17,55f., detects two more attempts in XI; cf. also Gressmann-Ungnad, *Das Gilgamesch-Epos*, 140; Böhl, *Ar*. *Or*. 18, 118.

153. For several fine insights on the progression of the episodes see Stamm, *op*. *cit*., 21f.; Inglott, *Melita Theologica*, 17, 1-18.

154. Kirk, *Myth*: *Its Meaning in Ancient and Other Cultures*, 144f.

155. *History Begins at Sumer*, 192.

156. Kramer, *JAOS* 64, 17f.; *AJA* 53, 15f.; Jacobsen, *ZA* 52, 116-118, n. 55; W. Heimpel, "A New Look at the Heroes of Sumer," address delivered to the 1971 meeting of the *AOS* (no. 13 in "Abstracts of Communications").

157. This omission is regarded by Ranke, *ZA* 49, 49 n. 3, as one of the epic's finest features.

158. Cf. Stamm, *op*. *cit*., 26.

159. *JAOS* 64,18.

160. *ANET*, 40:30-36.

161. So Kramer, *AJA* 53, 16, against his earlier assumption in *JAOS* 64,18; so too Böhl, *MVEOL* 7, 171,175.

162. Wilcke, *Lugalbandaepos*, 221 *sub* 413.

163. *Ibid*., 129:413-416.

164. *Ibid*., 5-8.

165. Cf. Kramer, *The Sumerians*, 275; for the possibility of a literary framework see the comment of Wilcke, *Lugalbandaepos*, 16 *sub* P.

166. *The Collection of Sumerian Temple Hymns* (*TCS* 3,1969).

167. *Ibid*., 25:135-139.

168. *Ibid*., 29:198-202.

169. *Ibid*., 91 *sub* 200.

170. *Ibid*., 175:126-131.

171. H. W. F. Saggs, *The Greatness that was Babylon*, 371; cf. Wilcke, *Lugalbandaepos*, 2f., n. 12; Kramer, *BANE*^{2}, 344 n. 12, 346 n. 40.

172. Gaster, *Numen* 1, 198.

173. Cf. Hallo, *JAOS* 88,72.

174. I exclude the flood story and include *UET* 6/1 no. 60.

175. Gilgamesh and the Land of the Living, 191f., Death of Gilgamesh B, 42; Gilgamesh and Agga, 114f.; Gilgamesh, Enkidu, and the Netherworld, 303; *UET* 6/1, 60:17; cf. Lugalbanda 417.

176. See H. Hartmann, *Die Musik der Sum. Kultur* (1960), 212-215; Sjöberg, *Or.* 35, 299.

177. E.g., the ends of "Enki and Ninhursag" (Kramer, *BASOR* SS 1, 20:278); "Inanna's Descent" (*PAPhS* 107, 515a:15); "Inanna and Ebiḫ" (quoted by Falkenstein, *ZA* 57 [1963], 124 *sub* 283; for the syntax of these doxologies see *ibid.* and Hallo-van Dijk, *YNER* 3, 63); on this classification of myths cf. Hallo, 17^e *RAI*, 117. Disputations can also end this way, e.g., van Dijk, *SSA* 50:309; 69:143.

178. Van Dijk, *SSA*, 69:142ff.; *ANET*, 42c.

179. See the discussion of the term by Landsberger, *JNES* 8, 295 n. 151 and Kramer, *Bi. Or.* 11, 171 n. 6; Hartmann, *op. cit.*, 227-229.

180. Cf. the examples collected by Falkenstein, *ZA* 49, 89-91, 102.

181. Cf. Bernhardt-Kramer, *WZJ* 6, 392:6, 82; Hallo, *JAOS* 83, 170:32a.

182. Hartmann, *op. cit.*, 212.

183. *ŠL* 332:129.

184. Landsberger, *ZA* 42, 156. Falkenstein misrepresents Landsberger's position by reversing the direction of the development (*An. Or.* 28, 4 n. 1).

185. Bezold, 186.

186. Hartmann, *op. cit.*, 192-219, especially 212ff. For the "almost generic force" of the term see also Hallo, *Bi. Or.* 23, 240,241.

187. Cf. for example, Shulgi A, The King of the Road, in *ANET*^{3}, 584-586.

188. *SLTNi*. 79: 49-62; studied by Edzard, *ZA* 53, 20-22. There is also a later, Akkadian, incantation to Gilgamesh: Jensen, *KB* 6/1, 266ff.; Lambert, *GSL*, 40; see *ibid*. 43 on Rm. 908, which Jensen (*op*. *cit*., 268f.) considered possibly a hymn to Gilgamesh.

189. Kramer, *SLTNi*, 26 *sub* No. 79.

190. Edzard, *ZA* 53, 20f.:51f.

191. Römer, *SKIZ*, 135:228; Hartmann, *op*. *cit*., 224-226.

192. Jacobsen, *BASOR* 102, 15f.

193. Atrahasis III,viii,15; Erra V, 49,59 (cf. *tanittu*, 52); En. El. VII, 161; cf. Lambert-Millard, *Atrahasis*, 7. Cf. also the Agušaya poem (*RA* 15, 180:vii,23) and the Adad "hymn" *CT* 15, nos. 3-4:3 (Römer in *Falkenstein* *AV*, 185).

194. Von Soden, *ZA* 40, 163-227; 41, 90-183; for subsequent bibliography see Römer *op*. *cit*., 185 n. 1; *JAOS* 86, 138-147; *WdO* 4, 12-28.

195. *BANE*^{2}, 342 n. 6.

196. *17^e* *RAI*, 118.

197. *Ibid*., 117, with reference to Falkenstein, *ZA* 50, 91.

198. Cf. Hallo, *17^e* *RAI*, 117.

199. Hallo, *Bi*. *Or*. 23, 241.

200. *17^e* *RAI*, 82,84.

201. For this and the following, see Lambert, *GSL*, 47f. To the private votive inscription *YOS* I, 3, cited *ibid*. (on the date cf. Edzard, *ZA* 53,24), add *RA* 10, 101 (private votive) and *UET* 8, 21 (vase dedicated to Gilgamesh by Ur-Nammu on the occasion of building Nanna's temple; to this association with Nanna cf. the first part of *SLTNi* 79, treated by Sjöberg, *MNS* 108ff.).

202. Preceded by Utuhegal of Uruk, who termed Gilgamesh his "protective spirit" (maškim = *rābiṣu*), Thureau-Dangin, *RA* 9, 115: iii,1-3; dupl. *RA* 10, 100:7.

203. Falkenstein, *ZA* 50, 75-77; cf. Hallo, *JCS* 20, 136f.; Jacobsen, *AS* 11, 89 n. 128; Shaffer, 10-12.

204. See Hallo, *JCS* 20, 136f.

205. Schott, *Kahle AV* (1935), 1-14; Castellino, *ZA* 52, 8; *RSO* 37, 132; cf. Falkenstein, *CRRAI* 2, 18; on all the foregoing see Matouš, *Bi. Or.* 21, 5; see also Hallo, *JCS* 20, 137 (for the general question of "the antiquity of Sumerian literature" see Hallo, *JAOS* 83, 167-176); Wilcke, *Lugalbandaepos*, 1-4; Landsberger and Matouš, *GSL* 32 and 93, respectively, simply refer to "circa 2000." However J. Klein has recently asserted that "the generally accepted theory that these [Sumerian] epics were composed in their present form already in the Ur III period probably will have to be modified, once a number of existing Ur III duplicates will be published" (*JAOS* 91, 297).

206. *ABL* 56, ob. 7-rev. 6; transl. follows R. Pfeiffer, *SLAB* no. 269; *CADṢ*, 202b; Lambert, *GSL*, 42.

207. G. Meier, *AfO Beih*. 2, 8:37f.

208. See Lambert, *GSL*, 42f.

209. *KAV* 218:A,ii, 5-7, 13-15; Weidner, *Handbuch der Bab. Astronomie*, 86: II,5-7, 13-15.

210. The text is translated in *CADA*$_1$,38 lex.; A$_2$, 358 lex.; E,409c; cf. Lambert, *GSL*, 56.

211. Kramer, *BASOR* 94, 7:29-31; see the revised translation in *ANET*, 5-52 and the study of Jestin, *Syria* 33, 113-118.

212. Cf. Gilgamesh's image of Enkidu in GE VIII, ii, 26 (Gurney, *JCS* 8, 94:19). For statues lasting to eternity cf. Lugal-e XI, 14 (quoted in *CADB*, 84b; Ṣ, 79a; cf. Falkenstein, *CRRAI* 2 [1951], 14).

213. *BWL*, 120: rev. 6f. References to the húb-bi-meš/*huppû* playing a role in the cult (Dossin, *RA* 35, 7:20-22; Kingsbury, *HUCA* 34, 10f.:96) may also be relevant, especially if the term means "acrobats" (so *CADH*, 240b) rather than "dancers" (Goetze, *JCS* 1, 82f.).

214. Seyffert, *Dictionary of Classical Antiquities*, ed. Nettleship and Sandys, 246c, 253d (gladiators), 427d (Pelops' funeral games; possibly the Olympian games).

215. Güterbock, *JCS* 5, 141, 160. Note how the introduction to the song, if correctly understood (see the discussion of Güterbock, p. 34), resembles the introductory lines of GE with their relative clauses (followed by a verb, if the frequent restoration of GE I,i,1f. is correct - but see the next note).

216. Whether the verb is first-person precative depends, of course, on whether it begins with the prefix *lu*-. Von Soden, *ZA* 59, 221, and *CAD*I/J, 33d, quote the line as if the *lu* is preserved, but no *lu* is shown in the copies of Haupt, *Nimrodepos*, p. 1, and Thompson, *GETh*. pl. I. At my request E. Sollberger kindly collated the tablet and wrote as follows (letter of May 12, 1971):

> ...you were of course right to query the existence of that *lu*. It is not preserved anywhere and I suspect its story can be reconstructed as follows.
>
> (1) CAD 7, 33: lu-[še]-⌜e⌝-di comes from
>
> (2) von Soden, ZA 53, 221: lu[-še-e!]-di, where the bracket after *lu* is due to a misprint (note the position of the hyphen), since von Soden refers to
>
> (3) Oppenheim, Orientalia 17, 17: [Let me make kn]own, which implies restoration of *lu* and specifically refers to
>
> (4) Campbell Thompson: [lu-še-i]d-di.

In the absence of a preserved *lu* there is no assurance that the line contained a verb. Böhl's restoration, [*adi ši*]*ddi māti*, "[to the en]ds of the land" (*Het Gilgamesj-Epos*^{2}, 102; accepted by Speiser, *ANET*, 73; cf. Heidel, *GE*^{2}, 16: "[within the confi]nes(?) of the land"), is not less plausible than those which assume a verb (besides Thompson cf. Landsberger *apud* Schott, *ZA* 42, 93 n. 1).

217. E.g., the catalogue of hymn incipits *KAR* 158: i,5?, 20, 21 bis, 22, 28, 30, 41; ii, 30 bis, 33; rev. iii, 13,19 (cf. also the first person singular present-future verbs in i,7; ii, 6,7; rev. iii, 20,23). The "myth" of Anzu has a similar beginning (see E. Reiner, *RA* 51, 107:1-4); cf. also Nergal and Ereshkigal, *STT* I,28: i, 1'-4' (Gurney, *An*. *St*. 10, 108f.: i,1',3'; *ANET*^{3}, 40d; cf. Gurney, *op*. *cit*., 106, top).

XUM

Ch. II. The Beginnings of Gilgamesh and Enkidu (GE I,ii, 1-41): Texts and Previous Suggestions.

This section of the epic is chosen to illustrate the combination of independent traditions because of (1) the apparent availability of several of the antecedent traditions, (2) the exemplary complexity of the antecedent material, which goes beyond anything suspected on the basis of critical analysis alone, and (3) the inherent interest of parts of this section for biblists.[1]

A. Texts

1. The late recension

After an introductory statement of theme (I,i,1-8) and a description of the inimitable walls of Uruk and the temple Eanna which Gilgamesh built (9-19), the remainder of the first column of Tablet I breaks off. Part of the missing section apparently described the creation of Gilgamesh (see below), the description concluding in col. ii, 1-3 (and following?). After a gap of a few lines the text sets in again with a description of Gilgamesh's oppressive treatment of the inhabitants of Uruk and their complaint to the gods (lines 6 or 7ff.). Precisely what Gilgamesh was doing is not altogether clear. In response to the Urukites' complaint the gods decide to create Enkidu as Gilgamesh's equal, intending thereby to check his tyranny (lines 18-32). Enkidu is created in the steppe, living at first an uncivilized existence with wild animals (33-41).

A hunter, whose traps Enkidu had been filling, brings a prostitute to draw him away from his animal companions and toward civilization. After seven days of cohabitation with her Enkidu undergoes a profound change. How sexual intercouse had this effect on him is not clear,[2] but he now becomes civilized, and in due course is brought to Uruk to meet Gilgamesh (from 42 through II [Rm 289],ii).

In the following inquiry we will seek the literary antecedents of GE I, ii, 1-41. The text we follow is the composite of Neo-Assyrian and Neo-Babylonian fragments presented by Thompson,[3] with some more recently discovered additions.[4] This composite text is justified since where the texts overlap we can see that beyond a few orthographic variants there is no substantial difference between them, at least in this section of the epic; this is the situation which usually seems to obtain wherever we can compare the two recensions.[5] The text reads as follows:

1. *šit-tin-šú* *ilu*(DINGIR)-*ma* [*šu-lul-ta-šú* *amelūtu*][a]
2. *ṣa-lam pag-ri-šú* [ ]
3. [*ul*]-*te-eṣ-bi* *t*[*a*?]
4. [ ] *da*? x[ ]
5. [ ]- *lam* [ ]
6. *i-na si-mat* x[x x x] x *tum*? [ ]
7. *i-ħa su-pu-r*[*u*] *šá* *Uruk*(UNUG)^{KI} *šu-ú* *it-t*[*a*]
8. *ug-da-áš-šá-ár*[b] *ri-ma-niš* *ša-qú-ú* *ri*-[ ]
9. *ul* *i-šu* *šá-ni-nam-ma* *te-bu-ú* ^{GIŠ}*kakkē*(TUKUL.MEŠ)-[*šú*]

10. ina pu-uq[c]-gí-šú te[c]-bu-ú ru-ʾu-š[ú]

11. [it]- ta-ad-⌜da⌝ -ri eṭlē(GURUŠ.MEŠ) šá Uruk(UNUG)^{KI}
ina ku-[ ]

12. ul ú-maš-[šar ^{d}]Gilgameš (GIŠ.GÍN.MAŠ) māru(DUMU) ana
ab[i](A[D])-[šú]

13. [ur-r]a u [muš]i([GE$_6$$^{\check{s}}$]^{i}) i-kad-dir še-x[ ]

14. [^{d}Gilga]meš([^{d}GIŠ.GÍN.]MAŠ?) š[u-ú rēʾ]u ([SIPA]D)
šá Uruk(UNUG)^{KI} su-[pu-ri]

15. šu-ú rēʾu(SIPAD)[-ni? gaš -ru šú-pu-ú mu-du-ú]

16. ul ú-maš-ša[r ^{d}Gilgameš batulta ana um- mi[d] -ša]

17. ma-rat qu-r[a-di ḫi-rat eṭ-li]

18. ta-zi-im-ta-ši-na [iš-te-nim-me ilāni]

19. ilāni(DINGIR.MEŠ) ša-ma-mi bēl(EN) Uruk(UNUG)[^{KI}....]

20. tul-tab-ši ma-a ri-ma kàd-ra [ ]

21. ul i-šu šá-ni-nam-ma [te-bu-ú kakkē-šú]

22. ina pu-uq[b]-qi-šu te![b]-bu-ú [ru-ʾu-šú]

23. ul ú-maš-šar ^{d}Gilgameš(GIŠ.GÍN.MAŠ) māra(DUMU) ana
abi(AD)-šú: ur-ra u muši(GE$_G$[$^{\check{s}i?}$])i-kad-dir še-x[ ]

24. šu-ú rēʾu(SIPAD)-ma šá Uruk(UNUG)^{KI} [su-pu-ri]

25. šu-ú re-ʾ-ú-ši-na-ma u [ ]

26. gaš-ru šu-pu-ú mu-du-ú x[ ]

27. ul ú-maš-šar ^{d}Gilgameš (GIŠ.GÍN.MAŠ) batulta (SAL.KALAG.
TUR) a-na [um-mi-ša]

28. ma-rat qu-ra-di ḫi-rat eṭ-[li]

29. ta-zi-im-ta-ši-na iš-te-nim-me il[āni?](DINGIR[.MEŠ?])

30. ^{d}A-ru-ru is-su-ú rabītam(GAL^{tam}): at-ti ^{d}A-ru-ru
tab-ni-[i amēla [e]]

XUM

31. e-nin-na bì-ni-i zi-kir-šú:

ana ūm(UD^{um}) lìb-bi-šú lu-u ma-[ḫir/šil?]

32. liš-ta-an-na-nu-ma Uruk(UNUG)^{KI} liš-tap-[šiḫ]

33. ^{d}A-ru-ru an-ni-ta ina še-me-ša:

zik-ru šá ^{d}A-nim ib-ta-ni ina libbi(ŠAG$_{4}$)-šá

34. [^{d}A]-ru-ru im-ta-si qatā(ŠU^{II})-šá:

ṭi-ṭa iq-ta-ri-iṣ it-ta-di ina ṣēri(EDIN)

35. [ina ṣēr]i? ([EDI]N?) ^{d}En-ki-dù ib-ta-ni qu-ra-du:

i-lit-ti ZIR-ti ki-ṣir ^{d}Ninurta(NIN.IB)

36. [šu]-⌜'⌝- ur šar-ta ka-lu zu-um-ri-šú:

up-pu-uš pi-ri-tu kīma(GIM) sin-niš-ti

37. i-ti-iq pi-ir-ti-šu uḫ-tan-na-ba ki-ma ^{d}Nisaba

38. la i-di nišē(UN.MEŠ) u ma-tam-ma:

lu-bu-uš-ti la-biš kīma (GIM) ^{d}Sumuqan

39. it-ti ṣabāti(MAŠ.DÀ.MEŠ)-ma ik-ka-la šam-mi

40. it-ti bu-lim maš-qa-a i-ṭip-pir

41. it-ti nam-maš-ši-e mē(A.MEŠ) i-ṭib lìb-ba-šú

1. Two-thirds of him is god, [one-third of him is human]
2. The form of his body [ ]
3. [c]ompleted [him]
4. [ ]
5. [The f]orm of [his body]
6. In the mark of [ ]
7. At/in the wa[ll] of Uruk he [ ]
8. He establishes himself supreme[f] like a wild bull, lofty [ ]

XUM

9. The onslaught of his weapon[s] has no equal.
10. His fellows stand (ready), waiting for his (command).[g]
11. The young men of Uruk are worried in their ...[ ]
12. Gilgamesh does not rel[ease] the son to his fat[her]
13. [Da]y and [nigh]t [ ] rages
14. Gilgamesh - he is the shepherd of walled Uruk!
15. He is [our?] shepherd, mighty, preeminent, wise!
16. Gilgamesh does not relea[se the young woman to her mother].
17. [h-]The warrior's daughter, the young man's spouse -
18. [The gods heard] their outcry.[-h]
19. The gods of heaven [called] Uruk's lord (Anu):
20. "Did you not create the mightywild bull?
21. The onslaught of his weapons has no equal.
22. His fellows stand (ready), waiting for his (command).
23. Gilgamesh does not release the son to his father.
Day and night [ ] rages.
24. He is the shepherd of [walled] Uruk
25. He is their shepherd and [ ]
26. Mighty, preeminent, wise! [?]
27. Gilgamesh does not release the young woman to [her mother].

XUM

28. The warrior's daughter, the young man's spouse -
29. The god[s] heard their outcry
30. They called the great Aruru: "You, Aruru, created [the man (Gilgamesh)]
31. Now create his counterpart[i]; his stormy heart let him [ ]
32. Let them contend, that Uruk may have ea[se]."
33. When Aruru heard this, a/the....[j] of Anu she conceived within her.
34. [A]ruru washed her hands, pinched off clay and spit[k] upon it.[l]
35. [On the plai]n? she created Enkidu, the valiant: native/offspring of .....[m] , ...[n] of Ninurta.
36. [Sha]ggy with hair is his whole body, he is endowed with a head of hair like a woman's.
37. The locks of his hair grow abundantly like Nisaba.
38. He knows neither people nor (civilized) land; he is garbed in a garment like Sumuqan.
39. With the gazelles he feeds on grass;
40. With the wild beasts he jostles[o] at the watering place;
41. With the teeming creatures he sates his thirst with water.

NOTES

a. Restored from IX, ii, 16 (Jensen).

b. Cf. *kī rīmi ugdaššaru eli nišī*, "like a wild bull he establishes himself supreme over the people" (I, iv, 39, 46; translation follows *CADG*, 56a.

c- -c. Following Landsberger, *WZKM* 56, 125 n. 49; see discussion below, ch. IV, D.

d. Following Thompson; see discussion below, ch. IV, B.

e. Restoration apparently confirmed by Old Babylonian version, below ch. II, C.

f. See note b. Grayson, *ANET*^{3}, *ad loc.*, translates "is made fearful;" since *ANET*^{3} retained Speiser's translation "lords it' in the related passages I, iv, 39, 46, the nearly identical wording of the three passages is obscured.

g. See note c- -c.

h- -h. To construe line 17 as the continuation of line 16 would unbalance the apparent parallelism of 16 with 12; it would also create some confusion in that 17 would not specify to whom Gilgamesh does not release the warrior's daughter and the noble's spouse, unlike 12 and 16. Following the lead of the Sumerian source, where it is females who raise the outcry (see below, ch. IV, D), it seems best to construe line 17 as *casus pendens*, anticipating line 18. Although Oppenheim (*Or*. 17, 22) construed 17 as the continuation of 16, he realized that it was the women who complained, concluding this from the feminine suffix on *tazzimtašina*; however, this in itself could be a grammatical imprecision in the text, to judge from similar passages quoted below (ch. III, A: K3657: 10; Nabonidus Cylinder: 9; Vision of the Netherworld:61) where *-šina* is used with no possible feminine antecedent.

i. The context seems to demand something like "image, counterpart, replica" (*CADZ*, 116e following Oppenheim, Or. 17, 23), but the philological justification for this rendering is uncertain. Schott-von Soden translate "that which he (Anu) commands," but this based on the erroneous assumption that the break in line 30 mentioned Anu; see note e, above.

j. This line is hardly clarified by line 31, where it is Gilgamesh's *zikru* which Aruru is to create. Elsewhere

XUM

Enkidu is (or is like) Anu's *kiṣru* (I,iii,4 and 31,vi, 23; Heidel, *JNES* 11, 140:7), and I suspect that this may be the intention here.

k. This translation is confirmed by the meaning of the related passage Atrahasis I, 234: *ru-uʾ-tam id-du-ú e-lu ṭi-iṭ-ṭi*. For a different conception of the operation Aruru performs on the clay see Hallo, *17^{e} RAI*, 128:8 and the notes thereto on pp. 130,134.

l. This translation (rather than "in the plain") follows from the previous note.

m. This word is variously read as *zirti* ("begotten," *GETh* 72 sub 35), *qulti* ("silence," von Soden, *ZA* 53, 222); *kulti* ("Lehmicht?" Schott, *ZA* 42,95), *kulti* < *kušti* ("herb," Dossin, *Academie Royale de Belgique*...42, 588 n. 2). Speiser, *ANET*, 74, and *CADI/J*, 72c *sub* b are noncommital.

n. See the discussions of Speiser, *ANET*, 74 n. 14; *GETh* 73 top; von Soden, *AHw*, 489b *sub* 9.

o. See Schott, *ZA* 42, 96f. and Speiser, *ANET*, 74 n. 18.

2. The Hittite Version

3 ša-am-ni-ya-an-ta-an UR.SAG-iš ^{d}x[ ]

4 ^{d}GILGAMEŠ-un ALAM-an ša-am-ni-ir-ma [šal-la-uš D^{meš}-uš(?)]

5 ^{d}GILGAMEŠ-un ALAM-an ^{d}UTU ŠA-ME-E-iš-[ši LÚ-na-tar(?)]

6 [p]a-a-iš ^{d}U-aš-ma-aš-ši UR.SAG-tar pa-a-iš ša[-am-ni-
ir-ma]

7 šal-la-uš D^{meš}-us ^{d}GILGAMEŠ-un ALAM-ši pa[r-ga-aš-ti]

8 11 AM-MA-TUM GAB-ma-aš-ši pal-ḫa-a-aš-ti 9 w[a-ak-šur(?)]

9 ^{uzu}mi!-ni-uš-ma-aš-ši da-lu-ga-aš-ti 3 [ ]

---

10 [nu] KUR.KUR^{meš} ḫu-u-ma-an-da ú-e-ḫe-eš-ki-iz-z[i na-
aš-kán]

11 ^{uru}U -ra-ga URU-ri a-ar-aš na-aš-za-kán x[ ]

12 nu-za UD.KAM-ti-li ŠA ^{uru}U-ra-ga LÚ^{meš} K[AL]

13 tar-aḫ-ḫi-iš-ki-u-wa-an da-a-iš nu ^{d}MA[Ḫ]
14 na-aš-kán ^{d}GILGAMEŠ-aš IM^{meš}-aš an-d[a]
15 ^{d}[M]AḪ-aš-ma?[ ]x-an a-uš-t[a]
16 [n]a-a[š-za Š]À^{bi}-iš?-š[i? ka]r-tim-mi-
ya[-at-ta-at]

---

17 nu D^{meš} ḫu-u-m[a-an-te-eš p]ár-ra-an-ta[ ]
18 tu-li-ya-aš p[í-di (?) -a]n pa-it nu[ ]
19 u-ni-in-wa ku-[in ^{d}GILGAMEŠ-un (?) š]a-am-ni-ya-at-
t[e?-en?]
20 nu am-mu-uk[š]a-am-ni-ya-nu-
u[n]
21 na-a[š-]x[a]n-da im-mi-y[a-]

.....

1 [nu D^{me}]š ḫu-u-ma-an-te-[eš]
2 [UR.SAG-i]n ^{d}GILGAMEŠ-un[ ]
3 [^{d}GILGAMEŠ-u]š-ša-wa LÚ^{meš} K[AL x x x x]
4 -a]š e-ni-eš-ša-a[n iš-ta-ma-aš-ta nu-kán
^{d}M[AḪ-a]š
5 -a]z-za mi-i-tar ar-ḫa da-a-aš na-aš-ká[n i-ya]-
an-ni-eš
6 U]R.SAG-in ^{d}En-ki-ta-an LÍL-ri an-da š[a-a]m-
ni-ya-at

---

7 UR.]SAG-iš ^{d}En-ki—ta-aš LÍL-ri an-d [a]?
8 [na-an MÁŠ.]ANŠE$^{hi.a}$ šal-la-nu-us—kán-zi nu-uš-ši x
9 x[-x-x]zi nu ku-e-ez MÁŠ.ANŠE$^{hi.a}$ ú-e-ši -[ya-u-wa-
an-zi]

10 i-y[a-at?-]ta-ri ^{d}En-ki-d[u-u]š-ša-ma-aš-ta [GAM-an i-ya-at-ta-ri]

11 š[a-ku-r]u-u-wa-u-wa-an-zi-ya [ku-e-ez i-ya-at?-ta-ri]

12 [^{d}En-k]i-du-ša-aš-ma-aš GAM-a[n i-ya-at-ta-ri]

3. (When he was) created, the heroic god[s?]
4. Gilgamesh's form. [The great gods] made
5. Gilgamesh's form. The heavenly sun-god to him [manliness(?)]
6. gave. The storm-god gave him heroism. Cr[eated]
7. the great gods Gilgamesh. His stature (lit. form) in height
8. (was) eleven cubits; his chest was nine w[akšurs(?)] wide;
9. his ... (part of body) was three [ ] long.

10. All lands he kept roaming. [ ]
11. To the city of Uruk he came. He did...[ ]
12. Daily the young men of Uruk
13. He kept on besting.[a] The moth[er]-goddess[ ]
14. And in/among the winds (of?) Gilgamesh [ ]
15. The [mo]ther-goddess saw [ ]
16. And [ ] in her heart she became angry.

17. Al[l] the gods [went] across/beyond [ ]
18. To the p[lace?] of assembly [ ] she went [and said?]
19. "That [Gilgamesh wh[om] y[ou(?)(pl)] have [c]reated,

20. I have [c]reated [his equal(?) "]
21. She mixed [t]ogether [ ]

.....

1. All [the god]s [ ]
2. [The valian]t Gilgamesh (accusative) [ ]:
3. "And [Gilgamesh] the yo[ung] men (accusative) [."]
4. [ ] thus she heard. And the mother-goddess
5. [from] took away growth(?) and she went (away[?])
6. [the va]liant Enkidu she created in the steppe

---

7. [the val]iant Enkidu in the steppe
8. [and the wild] beasts raise him, and to him
9. they [ ]. Wherever the wild beasts to gr[aze]
10. g[o], Enkidu goes [with] them,
11. and [wherever they go] to water,
12. [Enk]idu [goes] with them.

NOTE

a. The verb is tarḫ (without the particle -za) "triumph;" while the verb is frequently used in military contexts, the adverb "daily" suggests a contest or single combat; in Gurparanzaḫu 23' the verb is used for winning an archery contest. See discussion below, ch. III, C.

3. Old Babylonian material

The Old Babylonian version of part of this section came to light about twenty years ago at the University Museum in Philadelphia. The text is 2N-T79, which I have in transliteration by E. A. Speiser.[7]

[ ] *is-su-u ra-bi-[tam]*
[ ] *a-wi-lam ma-a-da*[
[ ]-*su ša da-an e-mu-qa*
[*li-iš*]-*ta-an-na-an-ma Urug*^{KI} *li-iš-*[*tap-ši-iḫ*]
[ ]-*zu a - ḫa - tam*
[ ]-*ti-ma iz - za - kar*
[*i*]*a-a-ru tab-ni-i a-wi-lam*

Lines 1-4 correspond with the Neo-Assyrian version's lines 30-32, though line 3 represents a substantial variant from the latter's 31. *da-an e-mu-qa* recalls the Neo-Assyrian version's I, iii, 3f.; v, 3; vi, 2, all describing Enkidu, and v, 18 describing Gilgamesh as *danna emuqa eliki iši*, "mightier in strength than you (Enkidu)." Here in the Old Babylonian text this quality of Enkidu's is one of those prescribed for him before his creation, and the passage clearly intends to make him Gilgamesh's equal in this respect (or almost so). Lines 5-6 have no counterpart in the Neo-Assyrian version; line 7 may repeat line 2.

Much of the Old Babylonian version's picture of Enkidu is inferrable from its description of how he becomes civilized (GEP cols. ii and iii). Enkidu's life with the animals is mentioned by the prostitute in ii, 12f.:

am-mi-nim it-ti na-ma-aš-te-e	Why with the wild creatures
ta-at-ta-[al]-la-ak ṣe-ra-am	do you range over the steppe?

From ii, 27-30 where the prostitute clothes Enkidu, and from iii, 26, *ilbaš libšam*, we learn that he was until now naked. His diet is described in iii:

1.	*ši-iz-ba ša na-ma-aš-te-e*	The milk of wild creatures
2.	*i-te-en-ni-iq*	he was wont to suck.
.....		
6.	*u-ul i-di* ^{d}*En-ki-du*$_{10}$	Nothing does Enkidu know
7.	*aklam* (NINDA) *a-na a-ka-lim*	of eating bread;
8.	*šikaram* (KAŠ) *a-na ša-te-e-em*	To drink strong drink
9.	*la-a lum-mu-ud*	he has not been taught.

The end of col. ii, which immediately precedes the lines just quoted, may have described Enkidu's erstwhile food - likely grass, as in the late recension. Col. iii, 22f., apparently refer to his hairiness:

> *ul-tap-pi-it* [*ma-li*]-*i*[8]
> *šu-ḫu-ra-am pa-ga-ar-šu*
> He rubbed [the shaggy grow]th,
> The hair of his body.

The general picture conveyed in the Old Babylonian recension agrees with that of the late recension; there are variations in detail, but none is necessarily contradictory. Both recensions agree that Enkidu ranged the steppe with wild animals and was hairy; both agree that he was unaccustomed to human food, but whether the missing section of the Old Babylonian recension specified, like the late recension, that he ate grass and drank water cannot be stated with certainty, although it seems implied; the Old Babylonian recension adds that he drank the milk of wild creatures, presumably in infancy; the question of clothing is uncertain: the late recension's "garbed in a garment like Sumuqan" has been taken to mean naked,[9] in agreement with the apparent implication of the Old Babylonian recension, but the phrase "in a garment" seems to imply some sort of skin garment.[10] It must be kept in mind when comparing the two recensions on the appearance of Enkidu that we are not comparing sections which correspond to each other in the narrative.[11] The late recension's parallel to Enkidu's meeting with the shepherds, where he was first introduced to the ways of civilization, was published by Heidel in 1952,[12] but is too poorly preserved to reveal what its version of these details was; while the Old Babylonian version of the description of Enkidu at creation is still unavailable. We therefore cannot judge whether each recension was internally consistent on these details. The Hittite version ignores Enkidu's hairiness and clothing or lack of it and specifies that he grazed and drank where the animals did, as does the late recension; one additional detail is unfortunately obliterated. The Hittite version's statement that the wild animals "raised" Enkidu is not paralleled in those sections of the Akkadian versions which we have been discussing, but is paralleled in the late recension, VIII, i, 2ff:[13]

2. ^{d}En-[ki-du ib-ri umm]a-ka ṣabītu a-ka-a-nu a-bu-ka
   i[b-nu-u]-ka ka-a-ša
3. ša u[s$^{?}$-m]u$^{?}$ zib-bi-šun i-ra-bu-u-ka ka-a-ša
   u bu-u-[ul$^{?}$]
4. [ṣēri$^{?}$] a-di kàl me-re-e...

Enkidu, [my friend] your mother a gazelle, a wild-ass your father, produced you;
They whose mark is their tails reared thee, and the cattle [of the steppe] and of all the pastures...[14]

B. Literary antecedents and affinities: Suggestions to date.

Probably because of its poor state of preservation little work has been done in seeking literary antecedents of the late recension's description of the creation of Gilgamesh. Oppenheim,[15] however, was able to observe that the traces in line 3 permit the restoration [ul/š]-te-eṣ-bi (he added the suffix-š[u]); he then pointed out the resemblance to Enuma Elish I, 91 which employs the same verb in a similar situation. Although he added that Gilgamesh's mother (whom he believed to be the subject of the verb) seemed to have followed the example of what was done in Enuma Elish, he offered no conclusions on the literary relationship between the two passages. Because of the better condition of the Hittite recension at this point, Otten[16] was able to point out several relevant parallels, including the endowing of qualities by the gods in other Hittite texts and the predetermination of the hero's bodily dimensions in the Sumerian inscription of Eannatum on the Stele of the Vultures. He, too, however, drew no literary-critical conclusions.

The rest of our passage has received considerably more attention. In his 1944 study[17] Kramer divided the chain of events culminating in the friendship of Gilgamesh and Enkidu into seven sections: (1) The Tyranny of Gilgamesh, (2) The Creation of Enkidu, (3) Enkidu and the Trapper, (4) The 'Fall' of Enkidu, (5) The Dreams of Gilgamesh, (6) The Civilizing of Enkidu, (7) The Struggle.[18] In searching for prototypes of these themes Kramer suggested that for "The Tyranny of Gilgamesh, with its pukku motif, we may find its Sumerian source in the poem 'Gilgamesh, Enkidu, and the Nether World'."[19] For the rest Kramer was unable to point to specific sources, although he felt that "the mytho-epic motifs in The Creation of Enkidu (note the Sumerian god-names Ninurta, Nidaba, and Sumugan), The Dreams of Gilgamesh, and The Struggle, certainly reflect Sumerian sources."[20] As for the remaining episodes, Enkidu and the Trapper, The 'Fall' of Enkidu, and the

Civilizing of Enkidu, no sources or provenance could be suggested.

Kramer argued that the chain of events as a whole, as it appears in the late recension, was created ad hoc for the purposes of the epic, and that therefore "we may safely assume that we will find no Sumerian counterpart of the chain of incidents as linked in the epic."[21] But he presumed that prototypes would be found for individual incidents in the plot chain, and that these need not always be Gilgamesh tales.[22]

Several decades earlier Jastrow had argued on the basis of his internal analysis of the epic (or what was then available of it) that most or all of the episode of "Enkidu [called Eabani in those days[23]], the Hierodule, and the Hunter" was actually taken from an independent tale of Enkidu that was originally unrelated to Gilgamesh.[24] Jastrow supposed, in fact, that a complete "Eabani" narrative once existed.[25] Jastrow's view agrees with Kramer's in assuming that the source was not (or not entirely) related to Gilgamesh tales. On the other hand, it is unlike Kramer's in implying that several elements of the plot chain were already linked in the source. Jastrow argued that the description of Enkidu was influenced by mythological ideas of hybrid beast-men,[26] while Enkidu's creation recalls the Biblical creation story in Gen. 2; we seem to have in this episode

> an ancient legend forming part of some tradition regarding the beginnings of man's history, and which has been brought into connection with the Gilgamesh Epic.[27]

> We...recognize in the story of Enkidu...an attempt to trace the evolution of primitive man from low beginnings to the regular and orderly family life associated with advanced culture.[28]

> Stripped of the connection with the Gilgamesh Epic the Eabani-Ukhat [the former reading of the prostitute's name or profession, now read Šamḫat[29]] episode reverts to some popular tradition recalling the separation of man from the early savage state when he lived his life with the animals about him...the figure of Enkidu is as close an approach to the 'first man' as one can expect to find in Babylonian literature.[30]

Jastrow argued his case on the basis of both internal and external evidence. The argument from within the epic is as follows:

1. The name Eabani implies that its bearer was created by Ea, but the epic has him created by Aruru; hence traditions have been mixed here.[31]

2. Who Enkidu originally was we cannot say, "but he has been used as an appropriate personage to whom to attach conditions that aim to recall the primitive state of the human race." The description of Enkidu shows "that he belongs to an entirely different period of culture from the one represented by Gilgamesh, who belongs to a different age."[32]

3. "The course of the narrative is not affected by the narrative of Enkidu's career, which has been deliberately and rather artistically forced into connection with Gilgamesh."[33]

XUM

4. "We should expect a hero like Gilgamesh to proceed directly against Enkidu. The introduction of [the hunter in an intermediary role] is a further cause for suspecting the original existence of an independent Eabani story."[34]

5. When Enkidu is taken to Uruk and Gilgamesh, the episode of Enkidu and the prostitute comes to an abrupt end, with no reason given for her disappearance.[35]

6. Enkidu takes no direct part in the adventures on which he accompanies Gilgamesh: in the fight against Huwawa Gilgamesh alone is celebrated as victor. Enkidu really has nothing to do with the insult to Ishtar and the Bull of Heaven episode. And why should Enkidu suffer stiffer punishment than Gilgamesh, the real offender?[36] Later, as noted above in ch. I, A, Jastrow reversed this argument, holding that Enkidu was the original hero of the Huwawa and Bull of Heaven episodes, which were secondarily transferred to Gilgamesh.[37]

7. Although Gilgamesh bewails Enkidu's death, his career proceeds undisturbed; Enkidu's disappearance is as superfluous as his introduction so far as the adventures of Gilgamesh are concerned.[38]

Jastrow concludes that the "Eabani-Ukhat" episode is attached to the career of Gilgamesh just as the flood story is at the end of the epic. He compares the method of composition of the epic to that of the Arabian romance of Antar and _The Thousand and One Nights_.[39]

Jastrow's argument from external evidence is based on the Biblical account of the creation and fall of man in Gen. 2-3.[39] He noted the following similarities:

1. Enkidu and Adam are created of earth, to which both return at death.

2. In the original form of the "Eabani Epic" Enkidu recognized in the prostitute (rather than in Gilgamesh) a companion, as Eve was a "mate" worthy of Adam.

3. Enkidu and Adam are led away from affiliation (sexual) with animals into sexual contact with their women.

4. Enkidu and the prostitute are naked, the latter unabashed, as Adam and Eve are naked and unabashed.

5. Adam is led by Eve and the serpent to awareness of his human dignity and power, and Enkidu is led by the prostitute and the hunter to a higher form of existence.

6. In Genesis this attainment eventually leads to death; Enkidu curses the prostitute and the hunter for bringing death upon him.

7. The names Eve (Khawwa)and "Ukhat" are related.

8. The hunter brings the prostitute to Enkidu, much as the serpent brings Eve to Adam. Both women take the initiative and conquer the men by arousing their sexual passion or instinct.

9. The prostitute promises Enkidu that he will become divine,[40] much as the serpent promises Adam and Eve.

Jastrow concludes that the "Eabani-Ukhat" episode constitutes "a Babylonian counterpart to certain phases of the Biblical story of Adam and Eve," stemming from a common tradition "regarding the beginning of things, and man's early adventures and method of life," which tradition was developed by Israel and Babylonia each in its own peculiar way.[42]

In the seven decades that have passed since Jastrow first published these arguments, fuller knowledge of the text of the epic has not surprisingly weakened or nullifield a few of his arguments. Those based on the name "Ukhat" fell when its correct reading, *Šamḫat*, was recognized.[43] It is not true that Enkidu's death has no effect on Gilgamesh's career; it is, in fact, the turning point in the epic.[44] Jastrow himself later modified his original theory in several respects, as noted above. We needn't review these modifications in detail, since here we are concerned only with the arguments concerning the creation and early life of Enkidu, which remained unchanged: Enkidu reflected traditions concerning the rise of mankind to civilization.

Several writers after Jastrow accepted the view that Enkidu somehow reflected Mesopotamian notions of the early history of mankind. S. R. Driver saw the parallel between Enkidu, Adam, and the original state of mankind as described in the Sumerian Lahar and Ashnan - a text whose relevance we will stress below.[45] Kramer noted in a general way that "the civilizing process which Enkidu underwent [may reflect] a Babylonian view of human development in general."[46] More recently van Dijk held it possible that the creation of Enkidu reflects an Uruk version of the creation of mankind by An; he cites other references to the creation of the seed of mankind by Aruru.[47]

On the other hand, a similarity between the description of Enkidu and certain stock descriptions of Amorites has been noticed by some writers. Already Jastrow and Clay, in arguing for Enkidu's Amorite origins, stated vaguely that I, ii, 39f. and parallels ("He ate herbs with the gazelles,/Drank out of a trough with cattle") "may rest on a tradition of an Amorite invasion of Babylonia."[48] Jensen saw Enkidu as a wild nomad and pillager, his friendship with Gilgamesh representing the union between urban king and the - perhaps sedentarized - bedouins,[49] while Thompson saw their meeting as expressing the superiority of the city over the desert.[50] In a study of the character of Enkidu Dossin took the entire epic to symbolize the meeting of the civilized urban dwellers of Mesopotamia, represented by Gilgamesh, with the plundering, uncivilized Amorite nomads, represented by Enkidu.[51] Oppenheim, too, referred to "the milieu of the Amorite rulers before they moved into the capitals of Mesopotamia...when the desert was still their home..."[52] Similar views have been expressed more recently by Gadd and Reiner.[illegible] In the next four chapters we shall evaluate these suggestions in the course of seeking the literary affinities and especially antecedents of the four episodes into which GE I, ii, 1-41 may be divided: the creation of Gilgamesh (ch. III), the oppression of Uruk (ch. IV), the creation of Enkidu (ch. V), and the early life of Enkidu (ch. VI).

NOTES TO Ch. II

1. For the parallels with the Biblical Eden narrative see Jastrow, *AJSL* 15, 193-214; Bailey, *JBL* 89, 137-150. For the parallel with the description of Nebuchadnezzar in Dan. 4 see Tigay, "Garden of Eden," in the forthcoming *Encyclopedia Judaica* (already noted by Jensen, *Das Gilgamesch-Epos in der Weltliteratur*, Vol. I, 195ff. C. A. Williams, *Oriental Affinities of the Legend of the Hairy Anchorite*, Part I, 50f. [ref. courtesy of Prof. T. H. Gaster]).

2. The prostitute's human intelligence is transferred to Enkidu through intercourse; one is reminded of the notion of transfer of qualities through intercourse. See Gaster, *Thespis*^{2} 257f.; *IDB* I, 131b. For another explanation see Stamm *As*. *Stud*. 6, 23f.

3. *GETh*. pl. I.

4. The NB fragment BM 34248 is recopied and joined with Rm 785 by Lambert in *CT* 46:19, adding some parts of lines previously unknown.

5. So Kupper, in *GSL* p. 99, on the basis of admittedly meager evidence (but he seems to have ignored BM 34248).

6. For the text, including restorations, Otten, *Istanbuler Mitteilungen* 8, pp. 98f., 118-120; Laroche, *RHA* 82, 121f. For an earlier study see Friedrich, *ZANF* 5, 2-5, 32-39. Translations and notes are given by Friedrich and Otten; translations of parts are found in Heidel, *GE*^{2} 17; and Schott-von Soden, *Das Gilgamesch-Epos*, 19f. Not being a Hittitologist I am dependent on the above works for translation. Prof. Hoffner reviewed the material with me and supplied a more literal translation to facilitate comparison with the Akkadian text; the final wording, however, is my own responsibility.

7. Kindly provided by Å. Sjöberg and Eichler; I first learned of the text from the reference by Shaffer, p. 23.

8. Schott, *ZA* 42, 104f.; Speiser, *ANET*, 77 n. 49.

9. Jastrow, *AJSL* 15, 200; Albright, *JAOS* 40, 320.

10. Oppenheim, *Or*. 17, 24 n. 4.

XUM

11. As Oppenheim, *ibid*., 26-29, may have assumed.

12. *JNES* 11, 140-143.

13. Pointed out by Otten, *Ist*. *Mit*, 8, 121, § 6.

14. Gurney, *JCS* 8, 92, 94; Speiser, *ANET*², 514d.

15. *Or*. 17, 20f.

16. *Ist*. *Mit*. 8, 118-120.

17. "The Epic of Gilgamesh and its Sumerian Sources," *JAOS* 64, 7-23,83.

18. *Ibid*., 18.

19. *Ibid*., 19, 20. This suggestion was seconded by Ranke, *ZA* 49, 47 n. 2, and later by Shaffer, but rejected by Böhl, *MVEOL* 7, 174, and, by implication, Landsberger, *WZKM* 56, 125 n. 49.

20. *Op*. *cit*. p. 19.

21. *Ibid*.

22. *Ibid*.

23. For the shift to the reading Enkidu see Jastrow-Clay, *YOS* IV/3, 24 with n. 41, with reference to Ungnad, *OLZ* 1910, 306.

24. Jastrow, *RBA*, ch. 23; *AJSL* 15, 191ff.; *YOR* IV/3, 32-47; *ZA* 13, 288-301; cf. Lambert, *GSL*, 51.

25. *AJSL* 15, 212.

26. *RBA* 474f.; *AJSL* 15, 200.

27. *RBA* 476-478; cf. *AJSL* 15, 197-204.

28. *YOR* IV/3, 40; cf. *AJSL* 15, 200.

29. See Jensen, *KB* VI/1, 375f. sub 2.6.

30. *AJSL* 15, 204.

31. *Ibid*., 199f.

32. *Ibid*., 200.

33. *Ibid*.

XUM

34. *Ibid*.

35. *Ibid*. 202f.

36. *Ibid*. 203.

37. *YOR* IV/3, 36ff.

38. *AJSL* 15, 203.

39. *Ibid*., 203f. For Jastrow's analysis of GE XI see *ZA* 13, 288-301.

40. *AJSL* 15, 198f., 205-214. The relationship to the Biblical narrative was accepted by Driver, *Genesis*, 41 n. 2; it was rejected by Stade, *ZAW* 23, 174f.; Gordon, *The Early Traditions of Genesis*, 56f.; T. K. Cheyne, *Traditions and Beliefs*, 73 n. 3; P. Heinisch, *Genesis*, 132. For the most recent study see Bailey, *JBL* 89, 137-150.

41. *AJSL* 15, 202 n. 33.

42. *Ibid*. 214.

43. Above, n. 29.

44. See above, ch. I, B.

45. Driver, *Genesis*, p. 41 n. 2; he refers to *SRT* p. 29: 19-24 and Burrows, *JRAS* 1926, 319.

46. *JAOS* 64, 9 n. 5; cf. N. K. Sandars, *The Epic of Gilgamesh*, 31.

47. *Act*. *Or*. 28, 24. Add now: Hallo, *17^{e}RAI*, 128:8.

48. *YOR* IV/3, 25.

49. *OLZ* 1929, 651.

50. *GETh*, 7.

51. G. Dossin, *Bull*. *Academie Royale de Belgique* 42, 589. Dossin argued that the bedouin motif was in fact a Babylonian reinterpretation of the original Sumerian version's picture of Enkidu as a Ma^{c}dān.

52. *AM*, 372 n. 41; cf. *Or*. 17, 24 n. 5.

53. *Iraq* 28, 108 n. 13.

54. Languages and Areas, 118. However, Reiner is more cautious than her predecessors on this subject, distinguishing between humanizing and urbanizing as two separate steps in Enkidu's development.

Ch. III. Literary Antecedents and Affinities of the Creation of Gilgamesh

The description of the birth of Marduk in Enuma Elish, cited by Oppenheim,[1] resembles the creation of Gilgamesh in several respects. Both passages describe a hero's birth or creation, use the verb *šuteṣbu*, are interested in the subject's bodily appearance, and in portions or types of divinity. Gilgamesh is "two-thirds god, one third human," while Marduk is given *šunnat ilussu*, "*šunnatu* of his[2] divinity."[3] The meaning of the latter is debated, some taking *šunnatu* as "equality,"[4] others as "a double portion,"[5] others as "different" (in his divinity, from the other gods).[6] Nor is the meaning of Gilgamesh's being "two-thirds god, one third human" entirely clear; its closest parallel seems to be with Lu-Nanna, who was 2/3-bi NUN.ME-e-ne: *šinipat apkalli*, "two thirds *apkallu*."[7] Nevertheless the general similarity between the Gilgamesh and Enuma Elish passages seems fairly clear.

However it cannot be confidently suggested that Enuma Elish served as a source from which the Gilgamesh Epic drew this description. Lambert has argued in recent years that Enuma Elish was only composed after Nebuchadnezzar I (1124-1103) recovered Marduk's statue from Elam;[8] there are, in fact, no texts of Enuma Elish antedating the first millennium BC; on the other hand the canonical version of the Gilgamesh Epic is thought to go back to the Kassite period,[9] and a date at least as early as c.1400 for the passage under discussion - though not for the exact wording of the text - is assured by the presence of a corresponding section in the Hittite recension.[10] The early date of this section urges caution regarding possible dependence on Enuma Elish. Furthermore, the additional material found in the Hittite recension increases the number of details which may serve as a basis for comparison, and leads to a different conclusion.

In comparing the Hittite and the late recensions what stands out most prominently is the Hittite's ALAM-*an*/*ši*, "(his) form," mentioned three times (lines 4, 5, 7), corresponding to the late recension's *ṣalam pagrišu*, "the form of his body" (line 2, perhaps 5). Not much can be made of the correspondence of *amēlūtu* (GE I,ii,1) and the restored *LÚ*-*na*-*tar* (Hittite, line 5), even supposing the restoration to be correct, since LÚ-na-tar means "manliness," corresponding to Akkadian *eṭlūtu*, *zikrūtu*,[11] while *amēlūtu* means "humanity." The term *šuteṣbû* also implies a context similar to the Hittite version: divine endowment of a king's features and qualities before or at his birth. This is the context in which the verb occurs in Enuma Elish I, 79ff. Apart from an obscure passage where a snake *šuteṣbû's* a man,[12] the Enuma Elish and GE passages are practically the only cases where the object of *šuteṣbû* is a person.[13] Elsewhere this form of the verb refers to the construction of buildings (once to sacred rites),[14] and this is what Speiser seems to have had in mind in his note on Enuma Elish I, 91 (where he translated "rendered him perfect") stating that "the technical term *šuteṣbû* refers primarily to the final inspection of their work by craftsmen before it is pronounced ready for use."[15] But the D-form of the same root (*ṣubbû*; the D-stem of a root can often be similar to or synonymous with the Š-stem[16]) is used with persons in contexts similar to our own - the birth sections of royal inscriptions[17] - and it is rather this usage to which our cases seem related. In these inscriptions the kings often describe how various gods endowed them with their qualities and features, which is precisely what we find in the Hittite recension. Assurbanipal, for example, describes himself as one

5. [*ša* ^{d}*Aššur*] *ab ilāni*^{MEŠ} *ina libbi*^{bi} *ummi-ia ši-mat*
šarru!-[*ti-ia i-ši-mu*]
6. [*ša* ^{d}*Nin*]-*lil ummu rabī-tu a-na be-lut māti u*
nišē^{MEŠ} *taz-ku-ra* [*ni-bit-su*?]
7. [ ]-*e* ^{d}MAḪ *alam-dím-me-e bēlu-u-ti u-ṣab-bu-u u*(?)-...
8. [^{d}]*Sin ilu el-lu aš-šu e-peš šarru-ti-ia uš-tak-li-*
ma ^{sal}*damiqti it-t*[*a-a-a-ti*....]
9. [^{d}*Šamas* ^{d}*Adad*?]*ba-ru-tú ši-pir la in-nin-nu-u*
ú-mal-lu-u qāt^{II}*-u-a*

10. [^{d}*Mar*]*duk apkal ilāni* ^{MES} *uz-nu ra-pa-aš-tu*
ḫa-si-su pal-ku-u iš-ru-ka ši-rik-tu
11. ^{d}*Nabû ṭup-šar gim-ri iḫ-zi ne-me-qi-šu i-qí-ša-an-ni*
a-na qiš-ti
12. ^{d}*Ninurta* ^{d}*Nergal dun-ni zik-ru-ti e-mu-qi la ša-na-an*
u-šar-šú-u gat-ti

5. [For whom Assur], father of the gods, decreed a kingly destiny while I was still in my mother's womb,
6. [Whose name Nin]lil the great mother (of the gods) named for the rulership of the land and people,
7. [ ]whose features the mother-goddess made into the image of a lord...;
8. [?]Sin, the holy god, caused me to see good omen[s] that I might exercise sovereignty;
9. [Shamash and Adad] entrusted to me the never-failing craft of divination;
10. [Mar]duk, sage of the gods, gave me a gift of great intelligence and broad understanding;
11. Nabu, the universal scribe, made me a present of the precepts of his wisdom;
12. Ninurta and Nergal endowed my body with heroic strength and unmatched physical vigor.[18]

Line 7 of this inscription contains the verb *ṣubbû* with the object *alamdimmu*, "image," similar to *ṣalmu* used in GE I, ii, 2 (and 5?); other inscriptions use *ṣubbû* with the similar *nabnītu*, "form, feature;" the noun *ṣalmu* is used with this verb once, though referring to an engraved

XUM

image rather than the king's endowments.[19]

This *topos* can be traced back to Sumerian royal inscriptions of the pre-Sargonic period.[20] The description of Eannatum's (25th or 24th century) birth on the Stele of the Vultures[21] (iv,9-v,15)[22] is strikingly similar to the description of Gilgamesh's birth in the Hittite version, with its stress on divine endowment of bodily dimensions:[23]

iv,9.	[^{d}Ni]n-gír-sú-[k]e$_4$	Ningirsu
10.	[a]⸢É⸣-[an]-na-túm	the seed of Eannatum
11.	[šà-ga]	in the womb
12.	[šu]-ba-ni-du$_{11}$-ga	implanted
13.	[^{d}Nin-ḫur-sag-ge]	(and) Ninhursag
14.	[ì-tud]	bore (him).
15.	[É-an-na-túm-da]	Over Eannatum
16.	[^{d}Nin-ḫur]-s[ag]	Ninhursag
17.	mu-da-ḫúl	rejoiced.
18.	^{d}Inanna-ke$_4$	Inanna
19.	á! mu-ni-dib	took him in (her) arm/by (his) arm,
20.	É-an-na	$^{a-}$"Eanna-
21.	^{d}Inanna	Inanna-
22.	eb-gala$_8$-ka-ka-a-túm	Ebgalkakatum"$^{-a}$
23.	mu mu-ni-sa$_4$	she named him.
24.	^{d}Nin-ḫur-sag-ra	For Ninhursag,
25.	dùg zid-da-na	on her (Ninhursag's) right knee
26.	mu-ni-tuš	she seated him,

27.	^{d}Nin-ḫur-sag-ge	and Ninhursag
28.	ubur-zid-da-ni	with her right breast
29.	⸢mu⸣-[kú]	nursed him.
v,1.	É-an-na-túm	Over Eannatum,
2.	a-šà-ga šu-du$_{11}$-ga	the seed implanted in the womb
3.	^{d}Nin-gir-su-ka-da	by Ningirsu,
4.	^{d}Nin-gir-su	Ningirsu
5.	mu-da-ḫúl	rejoiced.
6.	^{d}Nin-gir-su-ke$_{4}$	Ningirsu
7.	zapaḫ[b]-ni	his span
8.	mu-ni-ra	placed upon him;
9.	kùš iá-am$_{6}$	(to a height of) five cubits
10.	kùš-a-ne	his forearm
11.	mu-ni-ra	he placed upon him,
12.	kùš-iá zapaḫ aša	(making his total height) five cubits and one span.
13.	^{d}Nin-gir-su-ke$_{4}$	Ningirsu
14.	nam-gal-ḫúl-da	in great joy
15.	[ ] ⸢lugal⸣ ?	[ ] king(?)...

NOTES

a- -a. Meaning: "Fit-for-the-Eanna (-Temple)-of Inanna-of-the-Ebgal

b. For this reading of ŠU.BAD see Landsberger, *WZKM* 56, 109f.

All this suggests that the description of Gilgamesh's creation is modeled on such sections of royal inscriptions. This is certainly clear from the Hittite version and enough remains of the late recension to point unmistakably to the same conclusion for it. Something very much like these descriptions is found in GE I, v, 21f:

^{d}*Gilgameš* ^{d}*Šamaš* *i-ram-šu-ma*
^{d}*A-nu-um* ^{d}*En-lil* *u* ^{d}*Ea* *u-rap-pi-šu* *u-zu-un-šu*
Gilgamesh--of him Shamash is fond,
Anu, Enlil, and Ea have broadened his wisdom.

A few lines earlier (16-18) Gilgamesh is described as:

eṭ-lu-ta *ba-ni* *bal-ta* *i-ši*
zu-ʾ-na [*ku-u*]*z-ba* *ka-lu* *zu-um-ri-šu*
dan-na *e-mu-qa*...
radiant with manhood, vigor he has,
with ripeness gorgeous is the whole of his body.
Mighty in strength...

Otten called attention to these lines as a possible basis for restoring what is missing in the Hittite recension.[24] They are equally suggestive of what may have been found in the breaks in the late recension in I, ii, 1ff. Other passages in the late recension may likewise repeat material which was in I, ii, 1ff. Especially deserving of attention because of its immediate connection with "two thirds of him is divine, one third of him is human" (IX, ii, 16, as in I, ii, 1) is IX, ii, 14: *šēr* *ilāni*^{MEŠ} *zu-mur-šu*, "his body is the flesh of the gods." Another passage which speaks of a divine endowment is III, ii, 10 (addressed to Shamash): *lib-bi* *la* *ṣa-li-la* *te-mid-su*, "you endowed him with a restless heart." That these descriptions of the hero in the course of the epic should echo the description of his creation is natural.

That the Hittite version of Gilgamesh's creation goes back to a Mesopotamian original is further suggested by the absence of such motifs in Hittite literature from which the Hittite scribe might have drawn. The only thing of the sort is found in a myth of Hurrian provenance, the very text upon which Laroche based the restoration mentioned above, "Kingship in Heaven."[25] In the relevant passage the as-yet unborn storm-god declares:

> The earth will give me its strength, the sky will give me its valor, Anus will give me his manliness, Kumarbis will give me his wisdom, Naras will give me his..., Napsaras will give me his...[26]

This passage, however, says nothing of the divine endowment of dimensions, such as we find in the Hittite version. Otten refers[27] to two passages which describe creatures' dimensions, but these say nothing of divine endowment at birth. If any degree at all of non-Mesopotamian influence may be detected in this section of the Hittite version, it is to be found not in the basic outline but in variant details such as the prominent position of the storm-god in the endowment section.[28]

We conclude, then, that the description of the creation of Gilgamesh goes back at least to the Middle Babylonian period, as evidenced by its presence in the

Hittite version; that the Akkadian *Vorlage* of this part has been substantially preserved in the late recension, with which the Hittite version appears to be in agreement; and that this *Vorlage* was modeled on the sections of royal inscriptions which describe the divine endowment of kings' qualities and features before or at their birth.

In view of the numerous parallels between royal inscriptions and royal hymns,[29] and of the biographical content of the latter,[30] it would not be surprising to find this *topos* in the royal hymns as well. The hymns do indeed contain numerous formulas of the type "endowed with such-and-such a quality by the god so-and-so." For example Shulgi describes himself as one who was

> ^{d}Suʾen-e....
> nam-ur-sag nam-kal-ga nam-ti-nì-du$_{10}$ sag-e-eš
> rig$_{7}$-ga/á-maḫ-sì-ma-^{d}nu-nam-nir-ra
> granted heroism, might, and life in joy by Sin....,
> endowed with outstanding power by Nunamnir.[31]

In a hymn of Lipit-Ishtar[32] we find a series of such epithets which is quite comparable to the series recited in the Ashurbanipal inscription quoted above: Lipit-Ishtar was given his royal crown by An, scepter by Enlil, a favorable destiny by Ninlil, enduring charms by Nintu, was spoken to faithfully by Nanna, clothed in fearsomeness by Utaʾulu, granted wisdom and royal power by Enki, and had his head elevated by Inanna. I have not found these in pre-natal or birth contexts in the hymns. The hymns do speak of the king possessing certain of his qualities from the womb.[33] and it would not be unexpected for such an endowment scene to be discovered in one of the royal hymns. If this should happen we would have to modify our conclusion regarding the model for the birth of Gilgamesh, broadening it to include the royal hymns as well as inscriptions. For the present, however, our evidence comes only from the latter.[34]

The same sort of model may be suggested for the description of Marduk's birth in Enuma Elish, and this would account for the similarity to the description of Gilgamesh's birth which Oppenheim noted. Such features in Enuma Elish I as Maruk's nursing at the breast of goddesses (85f.),[35] his divine father rejoicing over him (90),[36] divine endowment of qualities (91),[37] superiority over his ancestors (92, 99),[38] and naming by the divine parent (101f.)[39] are typical features of royal inscriptions. This genre must, then, have served as the model for both the GE and the Enuma Elish passages we have been considering. Explaining similar passages in literature by assuming a common model or source is a standard procedure in the study of ancient literature; here we have the good fortune of being able to suggest just what that model was.

Excursus. A late account of the creation of Gilgamesh

A much later account of Gilgamesh's[40] birth is related in Claudius Aelianus' (c. 200 A.D.?) De Natura Animalium XII, 21:[41]

> A love of man is another characteristic of animals. At any rate an Eagle fostered a baby. And I want to tell the whole story so that I may have evidence of my proposition. When Seuechorus[42] was king of Babylon the Chaldeans foretold that the son born to his daughter would wrest the kingdom from his grandfather. This made him afraid and (if I may be allowed the small jest) he played Acrisius to his daughter: he put the strictest of watches upon her. For all that, since fate was cleverer than the king of Babylon, the girl became a mother, being pregnant by some obscure man. So the guards from fear of the King hurled the infant from the citadel, for that was where the aforesaid girl was imprisoned. Now an Eagle which saw with its piercing eye the child while still falling, before it was dashed to the earth, flew beneath it, flung its back under it, and conveyed it to some garden and set it down with the utmost care. But when the keeper of the place saw the pretty baby he fell in love with it and nursed it; and it was called Gilgamos and became king of Babylon.

Jacobsen suggested that Aelian's account "probably derives ultimately from Berossus."[43] Zimmern suggested that in substance the account probably went back to the Etana myth, but contained also an admixture of the Greek Danae legend[44] (Aelian himself, in his "jest" comparing Acrisius, recognized the affinity to the latter legend[45]). Most recently Edzard noted the absence to date of a Babylonian prototype for this tradition.[46] The story is certainly older than Aelian himself, since he incorporated it only to exemplify the kindness of eagles to mankind - a motif which must therefore have been in his source. But when this story is compared with numerous other stories about the birth and abandonment of future heroes[47] one notes that many of its motifs are paralleled in classical sources which could have been known to Aelian, so that an assumption of ultimate dependence on a Mesopotamian original is not compelling. The prophecy of usurpation,[48] the child's mother being the threatened king's daughter,[49] her isolation,[50] impregnation by an unseen father,[51] casting from a tower,[52] rescue by an eagle,[53] rearing by a gardener,[54] ultimate fulfillment of the prophecy[55] - all these motifs appear elsewhere, mostly in classical sources. One, however, is apparently paralleled only outside of classical sources - the child's foster parent being a gardener. Apart from Indian and Indochinese examples of this, which are not likely to have influenced Aelian, there is one source for this motif which immediately comes to mind - the birth legend of Sargon of Akkad (2334-2279).

The beginning of the legend relates as follows:[56]

1. Sargon, the mighty king, king of Agade am I.
2. My mother was an ēnu-priestess,[a] my father I knew not (var.: a father I had not).
3. The brother(s) of my father loved the hills.
4. My city is Azupiranu, which is situated on the banks of the Euphrates.
5. My mother, the ēnu-priestness, conceived me, in secret

she bore me.

6. She set me in a basket of rushes, with bitumen she sealed my lid.

7. She exposed[b] me in the river, which rose not over me.

8. The river bore me up and carried me to Akki, the gardener.

9. Akki, the gardener lifted me out as he dipped his e[we]r.

10. Akki, the gardener, [took me] as his son (and) reared me.

11. Akki, the gardener, assigned me to gardening for him.

12. While I was gardening, Ishtar granted me her love,

13. and for four and [ ] years I exercised kingship.

NOTES

a. The earlier interpretation of *ēnetum* as *ēntu*, "high priestess" (Jensen, *RLA* I, 322; Meissner, *BuA* II, 70), rejected for a time (Güterbock, *ZA* 42, 62 n. 2; Speiser, *ANET*^{2}, p. 119: "changeling(?)"), is now widely accepted (*CADE*, 173a; Hallo-van Dijk, *YNER* 3,6; Lambert-Millard, *Atrahasis*, 165 *sub* vii, 8-9; Astour, *JBL* 85, 193.

b. See M. Cogan, *JNES* 27 (1968), 133f.

The legend terms Akki, who reared Sargon, *dâlu* (LÚ.A.BAL),[57] "water drawer, gardener." Sargon himself is later appointed by Akki "to his gardening service" (*ana* *nukaribbūtišu* [LÚ.NU.GIRI$_{12}$-ti-*šu*]). Much earlier, the Sumerian King List had described Sargon as one....-ba-ni nu-giri$_{12}$, "whose.... was a gardener."[58] There have nat-

XUM

urally been many suggestions for restoring the beginning of this line, among them ab, "father," and (i)-dib, "foster-father" or "Aufnehmer," but they remain conjectural.[59] The Neo-Assyrian sources are sufficient to offer themselves as sources of the later tradition which, transferred to Gilgamesh, is reported by Aelian. Another feature of the Sargon legend may also be relevant in this regard: the statement "my father I knew not" (line 2). This resembles Aelian's statement that Gilgamos' father was "some obscure man" - the Greek term aphanous literally meaning "invisible" and thus referring to his simply having been undetected, rather than to humble circumstances. In similar classical legends the father's not being seen is due to his being a god who succeeds in impregnating the mother because he is able to slip in invisibly.[60] The Gilgamos story is somewhat exceptional in not accounting for the father's "invisibility" in this way, and in this detail, too, could therefore go back to the Sargon legend. However there is another plausible explanation, proposed by Langdon, which connects the "obscure man" mentioned by Aelian with the Sumerian King List's statement that Gilgamesh's father was a lillu-demon.[61]

That Aelian's account of Gilgamos' birth should have appropriated elements of the Sargon legend would not be surprising, since several other motifs in the Gilgamesh literature may have been originally Sargonic.[62]

NOTES TO Ch. III

1. *Or*. 17, 20f.

2. Various mss. identify Marduk's ancestor mentioned here as Lahmu, Anu, or Ea.

3. So the text given by Lambert and Parker, *Enuma Eliš ...The Cuneiform Text* [1966], *ad loc*. Previously the text was read *šu-un-na-at ili uṣ-ṣi-ip-šu*.

4. Bezold, 280a; cf. *CADA*$_2$, 172c (*Šinnat/Šunnat apkalli*).

5. Speiser, *ANET*, *ad loc*.; *CADṢ*, 227c.

6. Cf. Erra I, 23 and Cagni, *ad loc*.

7. Reiner, *Or*.30, 3:24', 26', contra Lambert, *JCS* 11,7.

8. In the *Meek AV*, 3-13. Lambert was anticipated in advocating a late date for Enuma Elish by A. Schott, *MVAG* 30/2, 123, who dated the epic after 800. Lambert's argument is basically that there is no evidence that the "exaltation of" Marduk, which the epic presupposes, took place before the reign of Nebuchadnezzar I. However van Dijk has adduced some such evidence for the late Old Babylonian period (*MIO* 12, 57-74).

9. Above, ch. I, preceding section A.

10. There can be no doubt that this section refers to the creation of Gilgamesh, not Enkidu; see Matouš, *Bi*. *Or*. 21, 8 *sub* S. 147.

11. Cf. Hoffner, *JBL* 85, 327 n. 4 on LÚ-natar.

12. *CT* 38, 34:19 (*CADṢ*, 227 sub 5). Lambert suggests that the meaning there could be "look upon" (*MIO* 12, 49 *sub* 12).

13. Lambert (*ibid*.)mentions one further possibility where, however, if the reference is to a person the meaning of the verb is probably "look upon" (cf. previous note).

14. *CADṢ*, 227b.

15. *ANET*, 62, n. 32.

16. *GAG* §§ 88c, 89d. Examples are by no means limited to stative verbs - see, e.g., *AHw* s.v. *kullumu*, *lamādu*, etc.

17. Examples using *ṣubbû* are collected in *CADṢ*, 226f. *sub* 3. For the *topos* in general see Labat, *Le caractère religieux*, 57-63; Jacobsen, *ZA* 52, 116 top, 126 with n. 80; Seux, *Épithètes Royales*, 19f.

18. Assurbanipal L^4 in Streck, *Asb*., 252ff.; translation in Luckenbill, *ARAB* II, § 986; both modified by collations in Bauer, *IWA* II, 84 n. 3 and translations in *CAD*.

19. *VAB* 4, 286: x, 37 (*CADṢ*, 227a). For other passages of the type we are describing cf. the entries collected in *CAD* s.vv. *gattu*, *bunnanû*, *zikrūtu*, *zumru*; *AHw* s. vv. *lānu*, *minātu*, *mešrêtu*, *nabnītu*.

20. See Labat, *Le caractère*, 61, for Sumerian and Old Babylonian examples.

21. See Sollberger, *RLA* III, 194f. for summary and bibliography.

22. Jacobsen, *JNES* 2, 120f.; Kramer, *The Sumerians*, 310; Sollberger, *Le System Verbal*, pp. 79, 98, 124.

23. Pointed out by Otten, *Ist*. *Mit*. 8, 118-120.

24. *Ibid*., 119.

25. Laroche, *Cat*. #238; *ANET*, 120f.

26. *ANET*, 121a, Par. 2.

27. *Ist*. *Mit*. 8, 118f.

28. *Ibid*., 119 § 3.

29. Hallo, *17^{e}RAI*, 118f.; cf. the comment of Falkenstein in *SAHG*, 371 *sub* 28.

30. Hallo, *op*. *cit*., 118.

31. Falkenstein, *ZA* 50, 70f.:97-99; transl. also in *SAHG*, 118; Kramer, in *ANET*^{3}, 586.

32. *SAHG*, 127:43-58.

33. E.g., *SAHG*, 115:1; 126:1; Hallo, *JCS* 20, 141:9. Note

XUM

especially the birth section of the Ur-Nammu hymn published by Castellino, *ZA* 53, 122:43-49, but note that the divine endowment (of wisdom; lines 60f.) is separated from it by several lines.

34. Cf. also the inscriptional passages describing the king's divine predestination for kingship while still in the womb, collected by S. M. Paul, *JAOS* 88, 184f.

35. See the Stele of the Vultures (=STV) iv, 27-29 (above); Hallo, *Early Mesopotamian Royal Titles*, 136f.; M. J. Seux, *Épithètes Royales Akkadiennes et Sumeriennes*, 419 *sub* kú; Labat, *op. cit.*, 64.

36. Cf. STV v, 1-5; *RA* 11, 109:5.

37. Cf. STV v, 6ff.; Assurbanipal passage quoted above and others referred to in sources listed in nn. 17-18; *RA* 11, 109:5-11.

38. E.g., *CT* 36, 6: i 5 (Kurigalzu; *CAD* A$_1$,72ab); *IR* 36:38 (Sargon; *CADḪ*, 127a).

39. STV iv, 20-23; Hallo, *Titles*, 133f.; Seux, *Épithètes*, 175-8, 205, 370f., 433f., 438, s.vv. *nabû*,*nibītu*, *zakāru*, p à, and s a$_4$.

40. A few have expressed reservations whether Gilgamos is really Gilgamesh: Gadd *apud* Budge, *The Babylonian Story of the Deluge*, 41 n. 1; Höfer in Roscher, *Lexikon*, IV, 789 ("zweifelhaft"); Jeremias, *ibid.*, II, 774 denies it outright.

41. Eng. tr. by A. F. Scholfield, *On Animials (LCL)*, III, 38-41; German paraphrase in Schott-von Soden, *Das Gilgamesch Epos*, 17; summaries in Jacobsen, *AS* 11, 89 n. 128; Edzard, in Haussig (ed.), *WbMyth*, 73; Thompson, *GETh*, 9f.; Langdon, *OECT* 2, 12 n. 3.

42. Apparently Enmerkar. See Jacobsen, *AS* 11, 87 n. 115 (see Hallo, *JCS* 17, 52); Schott-von Soden, *op. cit.*, 17; Edzard, *op. cit.*, 73. This text makes Gilgamesh the immediate successor of Enmerkar, a conception appearing also in the *scholia* of Theodor bar Koni (see Jacobsen, *AS* 11, 87 n. 115).

43. *AS* 11, 87 n. 115.

44. In Schrader, *KAT*^{3}, 565 and n. 3.

45. See Scholfield, *op. cit.*, 39 n. a; Binder, *Die Aussetzung des Königskindes Kyros und Romulus*, § 8.

XUM

46. *Loc. cit.*

47. See Redford, *Numen* 14, 209-228; Binder, *op. cit.*; O. Rank, *The Myth of the Birth of the Hero and Other Essays*; Stith Thompson, *Motif Index*, R 131, S 300-399.

48. Redford, Section II (nos. 15-27).

49. E.g., Binder, § 8 (Perseus), § 7 (Telephos), and Cyrus.

50. E.g., Binder, §§ 7,8.

51. Binder, § 8.

52. Pausanias iv, 18 (about Aristomenes).

53. Binder, § 60; cf. the preceding note. Compare also Gaster, *Myth, Legend, and Custom in the OT*, 319f. The Etana myth (cited by Zimmern [above, n. 44]) is irrelevant, since Etana's flight on an eagle is not a rescue.

54. Stith Thompson, *MI*, R 131.8.2. All cases listed there of the foster parent being a gardener are from India and Indochina.

55. Redford, section II, *passim*.

56. *CT* 13, 42f.; *CT* 46, 46; ed. by King, *CCEBK* II, 87-96; cf. Jensen in *RLA* I, 322-324; Güterbock, *ZA* 42, 62-64; *CADD*, 57d (on lines 8-11); trans. by Speiser, with revisions by Grayson, *ANET*^{3}, 119. On the text's genre cf. Grayson and Lambert, *JCS* 18, 8; on its relationship with Moses' birth story see Childs, *JBL* 84, 109f.; Greenberg, *Understanding Exodus*, 198f.

57. *CADD*, 57b lex.

58. *AS* 11, 110:32. On the term lú-nu-giri$_{12}$ see most recently Gadd, *RA* 63, 2; Edzard, *ZA* 55, 91ff.

59. It has recently been suggested that the term "gardener" may have been applied as an epithet to kings or their substitutes in the sacred marriage of the New Year's ritual (Hallo and van Dijk, *YNER* 3,6). If the original meaning was technical it was nevertheless taken literally by the later tradition which clearly considers Akki a real gardener (Sargon legend, lines 8f.). Cf. Speiser, *Genesis*, 27, for "derivative material...sometimes [being] taken more

XUM

literally than the original sources intended."

60. E.g., Redford, *op*. *cit*. nos. 21, 22, 26; cf. no. 2.

61. Langdon, *OECT* 2, 12; cf. Thompson, *GETh*, 9f.; Shaffer, 10f.

62. Matouš in *GSL* 93; A. Malamat, *AS* 16, 373 n. 42.

Ch. IV.

Literary antecedents and affinities of the Oppression of Uruk.

How Gilgamesh oppressed Uruk is one of the most elusive problems of the epic. By far the most common view is that the oppression consisted at least in part of imposing corvée labor upon the people of Uruk, a view which has been expressed almost (but not quite) as long as the text has been known.[1] Once the Pennsylvania tablet of the Old Babylonian recension became known most scholars agreed, on the basis of its lines 154-156, that Gilgamesh had also been demanding the *jus primae noctis* (or, to use the term more befitting Gilgamesh's status, the *droit de seigneur*).[2] Before searching for the literary antecedents of the oppression of Uruk, we shall have to examine these and other theories.

A. *Corvée*

At an early stage in the research for this dissertation I entertained seriously the theory that Gilgamesh was imposing the corvée. If this is what the text means, it would have attractive literary-critical implications. For to our conclusion that the creation of Enkidu is modeled on the Atrahasis Epic's creation of mankind (below, Ch.V), we would be able to add that the events leading up to the creation of Enkidu in GE were modeled on the events leading up to the creation of man in Atrahasis: just as man was created to relieve the gods of their corvée, so Enkidu was created to relieve (albeit in a different way) the Urukites of theirs. Our comparison of the two texts (below, Ch. V) would then begin with the following:

GE I,ii	Atrah. I
7-16 Urukites oppressed, at least partly, by forced labor imposed by Gilgamesh (Gilgamesh oppresses day and night: *urra u mūši*).	1-38 Igigi-gods oppressed by forced labor imposed by Anunnaki gods (night and day: *mūši u urra*)
17-29 Complaint (*tazzimtu* of women of Uruk brought to [Anu], who is (by inference) sympathetic.	39-191 Igigi complain (*uttazzamu*), then go to Enlil; complaint eventually communicated to Anu and Enki, who are sympathetic

In view of the striking correspondences which the continuation of this comparison displays (below, Ch. V), this would have provided a very satisfactory model for several features of the oppression of Uruk and, like GE's indebtedness for the creation of Enkidu to traditions reflected in Atrahasis, would have conformed with GE's similar indebtedness to traditions reflected in Atrahasis' version of the flood[3] (n.b. especially the reference to Utnapishtim as Atrahsis in GE XI,187, and the fact that GE XI,15-18 quote Atrah. I, 7-10 almost verbatim).

There is no question that, like Atrahasis, GE begins with acts which lead to a complaint to the gods. What may be said in favor of the view that the oppression in GE included the corvée? On historical grounds it is indeed plausible that Gilgamesh built the wall of Uruk, a project which naturally involved forced labor. The epic itself refers to his building the wall (I,i,9-19; XI, 303-305); by placing these references at the beginning and end of the epic and thus enveloping it, the epic surely stresses the importance of this achievement.[4] An inscription of AN-àm,[5] a later king of Uruk (c. 1821-1817)[6] refers to the wall as nì-dím-dím-ma-libir-ra ^{d}Gilgameša-ke$_4$, "the ancient structure of Gilgamesh."[7] According to Kramer an unpublished fragment of "The Death of Gilgamesh" "seems to speak of a corvee (zi-ga) laid on the people of Erech and Kullab, and of the building of a structure with various kinds of stone and with some sort of gold ornamentation."[8] Another building activity of Gilgamesh was the construction of the chapel of Enlil in Nippur.[9] Since archaeological evidence agrees that the wall of Uruk was built in the Early Dynastic period,[10] and since the second Early Dynastic period, in which Gilgamesh himself apparently lived,[11] is especially characterized by the wide-spread appearance of great city walls,[12] this tradition has historical plausibility. It was this period in which royal power grew strong,[13] and it is no surprise that the emergent exercise of this power was remembered as tyrannical, just as later in Israel the reigns of Solomon and Jeroboam I were so regarded.[14]

The picture of Gilgamesh as a tyrannical ruler may also appear in omen literature. Although this genre is credited with a relatively high degree of historical reliability,[15] it has been doubted that this applies in the case of Gilgamesh omens. The mention of Gilgamesh in these omens is anomalous since the continuous tradition of historical omens sets in only with the Akkad dynasty.[16] Güterbock believed the collection(s?)[17] of omens about Gilgamesh to have been derived from the epic itself,[18] and Finkelstein[19] added that some were borrowed from traditions about Sargon.[20] However, Lambert, though sharing the negative evaluation of the collection's reliability,[21] noted that some of its apodoses refer to events neither in the epic or likely to have been in it.[22] Whatever may be the antiquity and reliability of these omens, the meaning of their picture of Gilgamesh depends on the meaning of *šarru dannu*[23] and LUGAL ŠÚ in their apodoses.[24] The most common Gilgamesh omen is *amūt ^{d}Gilgameš šarru dannu ša māḫira lā išû*, "omen of Gilgamesh, the *dannu* king, who had no rival." In *Šumma izbu* II,6 the apodosis is *amūt ^{d}Gilgameš ša māta ibēl* LUGAL ŠÚ *ina māti ibašši*, "omen of Gilgamesh who ruled the land, (meaning) there will be a ŠÚ king in the land." Usually *dannu* is taken simply as "mighty"[25] and ŠÚ as having its usual meaning *kiššatu*, "(king of) the universe."[26] However Leichty, following *CADD*,98a, translates *dannu* as "harsh," and translates ŠÚ as "despotic." The latter translation is based on the *Šumma izbu* commentary, I, 7-9:

> LUGAL ŠÚ *ina* KUR GÁL-*ši*
> ŠÚ : *kiš-šá-tú*
> ŠÚ : *a-ḫu-u* [27]

Presumably Leichty understands ŠÚ to have its second reading, *aḫû*, "hostile," in the present context. Now there is a syllabically written apodosis *LUGAL ki-(iš-)ša-tim ina mātim ibbašši* in *YOS* X, 17:8; 56:I,37 and III,25,33,[28] and one might ask why that reading of ŠÚ, meaning "(king of) the universe," is not considered at least equally possible here; indeed, the place of *kiš-šá-tú* before *a-ḫu-u* in the commentary might even make that reading preferable. On the other hand, a commentary on *Šumma ālu* (*CT* 41,30:14) explains LUGAL ŠÚ in the latter series thus: LUGAL ŠÚ: LUGAL ŠÚ: LUGAL *a-ḫu-ú*: ŠÚ: *kiš-ša-tu*$_4$: ŠÚ: *a-ḫu-ú*.[29] In other words, even though the reading *kiššatu* precedes *aḫú*, the meaning of ŠÚ in LUGAL ŠÚ is *aḫû*, "hostile." If the interpretation of one or both of these terms is correct, we would have Gilgamesh's tyranny attested in omen literature, but whether this reflects an independent tradition or an interpretation of the epic we cannot say. Nor would the simple adjectives "harsh" and "despotic" necessarily help us to define the nature of the oppression of Uruk.

Nevertheless the above discussion makes it entirely plausible on *a priori* grounds that Gilgamesh should be represented as imposing corvee on the people of Uruk. But whether this is actually intended in the epic must ultimately be demonstrated from the text of the epic itself. The corvee theory appears to have originated with Jensen when he realized that I,i,9 refers to Gilgamesh's building the wall of Uruk[30]. (Jastrow and Jeremias, writing before Jensen, did not think Gilgamesh had imposed corvee[31]); subsequently reference to the walls was made by several advocates of this theory.[32] Oppenheim in fact remarked how "Very skillfully the author...links the description of the marvelous seven walls of Uruk [in I,i,9-19] to the story of their construction. He tells...how Gilgamesh compelled the men of Uruk to do villein service..."[33] But already in 1911 Gressmann had doubts about this connection, reasoning that if I,i,9-13 belong to the epic's introduction (rather than the plot) it would be doubtful whether the inhabitants of Uruk were really complaining about the drudgery of building the wall.[34] Now, especially in view of the epic's conclusion (XI, 303-305) there can be no doubt that I,i,9-19 do stand apart from the plot and comprise a part of the framework. To this it ought to have been added that (contrary to Oppenheim's statement about the linking of the two sections) more than thirty now-missing lines separate that introduction from the description of the oppression, and that in between these two sections was a description of Gilgamesh's birth (I,ii,1-3 and the parallel Hittite version I,3ff.) The assumed connection of the Oppression with the building activity described in I,i,9ff. is thus baseless.

Such a connection might be argued today on the basis of I,ii,7, of which a few more signs have now been recovered, giving the reading: *i-na su-pu-r[i] šá Uruk*^{KI} *šu-ú it-t*[a],[35] "at/in the wall of Uruk he ...[...][36] Not much can be learned from such a broken line. Nothing in it suggests anything oppressive, and the fact that the gods' description of the offense (lines 20-23) covers only what is reported in lines 9-17 suggests that line 7 may not be an integral part of the offense.

Some two decades after Gressmann, Jacobsen scrutinized the corvée theory and found it wanting on several grounds.[37] Since the available text does not make the nature of the oppression clear, Jacobsen reasoned that, in view of the gods' creating Enkidu to put a stop to the oppression, our starting point must be in asking what Enkidu put an end to.

> As to the supposed building activities Engidu did in no way interfere with them, as far as our knowledge goes, not even by turning Gilgamesh's attention towards warfare and exploits. As for the latter, he even sought to hold him back when he wanted to go towards Humbaba.[38]

This objection is true so far as it goes, but it is inconclusive since much of the Neo-Assyrian version of Tablet II is missing. In a footnote Jacobsen referred also to

> the most extraordinary "democratic" attitude of the gods who - if the current [corvée] view is correct - want to hinder the building of the city wall because of the labour which it inflicts upon the common people; an attitude which would be without parallel in ancient literature.[39]

The latter argument is without foundation, for this attitude is reflected in the divinely-protected kidinnūtu status[40] by which certain old and important cities were exempt from the corvée, some or all types of military service, and some taxes.[41] The cities most prominently said to enjoy this status in later times are Sippar, Nippur, Babylon, Assur and Harran,[42] but Oppenheim suggests that the concept has roots as old as the Ur III period. In the myth of Adapa such a status is granted to Eridu by Anu.[43] Mitigation, if not abolishment, of the corvée even found royal advocacy in the institution of *andurāru*, which is attested from late pre-Sargonic times on.[44] That the gods should act to deliver Uruk from a harsh corvée would thus not be surprising.

Such a theme would have cuneiform literary parallels. The fragmentary text K3657[45] includes motifs whose similarity to parts of Atrahasis was noted by Finkelstein.[46] This similarity would be significant for our discussion if we should conclude that Gilgamesh's oppression did include the corvée. The first column of the text reads as follows:

1. [ ] x *nu ab* x x
2. [ ]-*ti-šú lib-ba-šú il-te-em-na*
3. [ ] ⸢*a*⸣-*bi* ⸢*ka-la* DINGIR⸣.MEŠ *i-zi-ru*
4. [*t*]*i-šú lib-ba-šu il-te-em-na*
5. [*mār Nippuri* (?)[a]] *ṣa-mi-id a-na il-ki-im*
6. [*ṣeḫer* (?) *ù r*]*a-bu-ú ú-ba-al-lu dul-la*
7. [*mār* KA].DINGIR.RA^{KI} *ṣa-mi-id a-na il-ki-im*
8. [*ṣeḫer* (?)] *ù ra-bu-ú ú-ba-al-lu dul-la*
9. [*i-na i*]*m-ma-as-si-na ka-la* *u*$_4$*-mi i-šu-uš*
10. [*i*]—*na ta-az-zi-im-ti-ši-na i-na ma-aja-li*
11. *ú-ul ú-gat-ta ši-it-ta*
12. [*i—n*]*a ug-ga-ti-šu-ma ne-me-qa-am i-sa-pa-aḫ*
13. [*a-na*] *šu-ba-al-ku-ut pa-le-e pa-ni-šú iš-ku-un*

14. [*uš-t*]*an-ni* *ṭè-ma ut-tak-ki-ra mi-lik-šu-un*
15. [ ] x [ ] *ra a-lak-ta ip-tar-sa*
16. [*ispun*] x PI .PI-*ta pa-ra-ak-ki*
17. [ ] x BIL? *ak-ku-* x

1. ....
2. ....he became angry
3. ....the father of all the gods became hostile[b]
4. ....he became angry
5. [The citizens of Nippur(?)[a]], compelled[c] to (perform) corvée-labor-
6. [small and gr]eat performed[d] the service;
7. [the citizens of Ba]bylon, compelled[c] to (perform) corvée-labor-
8. [small and g]reat performed[d] the service;
9. [at] their "How long!?" (?)[e] he was disturbed all day,
10. [be]cause of their outcry, on his bed
11. sleep could not overcome him.
12. [I]n his anger he "scattered"(their)[f] sense;
13. he determined [to] overturn the dynasty,
14. [he dis]tracted (their)[f] reason, perverted their counsel.
15. ....he blocked the road(s)
16. [he cast down (?)[g]] ....dwellings
17. ???

NOTES

a. So *CADṢ*, 91a; I/J, 77d.

b. If this verb can be construed as a stative; contrast King:

"he hated the father..."

c. Taking *ṣamid* as passive.

d. Deriving *ú-ba-al-lu* from (w)*abalu*, rather than *balu*/*bullu* (so Finkelstein, *JBL* 75, 330 n.7: "abolished the rites".)

e. In view of the parallel *tazzimtu* some word for "outcry" seems demanded; I take this as a nominalized (*adi*) *immati*. For the addition of a pronominal suffix to a nominalized interjection cf. the examples with the synonymous (see *BWL* 50:37 Comm.) *aḫulap* cited in *CADA*$_1$, 213f.

g. Cf. Finkelstein, *JCS* 11, 86:6: *alāni tilāni u parakkē ispun*, "it swept away cities, tells and dwellings."

A similar pattern appears in Cyrus' cylinder inscription[47] which opens with a description of Nabonidus' offenses which led Marduk to reject him in favor of Cyrus. After describing Nabonidus' removal of the images of the gods from their thrones,[48] and several other religious offenses, the text states that:

8. *li-mu-ut-ti āli-šú* [*i-te*]*-ne-ep-pu-uš u-mi-šá-am-ma na-*[
nīšē]$^{\text{MEŠ}}$ *i-na ab-šá-a-ni la ta-ap-*
šú-uḫ-tim ú-ḫal-liq kul-lat-si-in

9. *a-na ta-zi-im-ti-ši-na* ^{d}*En-lil ilāni*$^{\text{MEŠ}}$ *iz-zi-iš i-gu-ug-ma*...

8. Daily he used to do evil against his (Marduk's) city...
He tormented its inhabitants with corvée-work (lit.: a yoke[a]) without relief, he ruined them all.

9. Upon their complaints the lord of the gods became terribly

angry...[49]

NOTES

a. Cf. *CADA*$_1$, 66b.

b. Translation from Oppenheim, ANET, 315c.

"A Vision of the Netherworld"[50] includes the following warning from Nergal to the prince Kumma:

60. [la? ta]m?- [t]a -ši-ma la tu-maš-šar-an-ni-ma di-in ka-
ra-ši-i ul a-ša-am i-na qi-bit ^{d}šá-maš ep-pe-ru da-ṣa-a-ti
ù saḫ-ma-šá-a-[ti]

61. [...]? iš?-te-niš lid-di-ba-ni-ka-a-ma ina ḫu-bu-ri-ši-n[a]
(... ..?!) [š]am-ra-a-ti a-a ir-ḫi-i-ka ši-it-t[ú]

> Forget and forsake me not, and I will not impose the death sentence; (yet) at the command of Shamash, shall distress, oppression, and disorders
>
> ... shall together blow thee down; because of their fierce uproar sleep shall not engulf thee.

Here the cause of the uproar, or outcry, is not specifically forced labor but rather several types of oppression and/or disorders.

In each of these passages we find the pattern: oppression-outcry-divine response. Like Gilgamesh (and Atrahasis), the oppression in K3657 and the Cyrus cylinder is (or is at least partially) corvée labor; in both of the latter as well as the "Vision of the Netherworld" the victims' outcry disturbs the gods' sleep (as in Atrahasis, but not Gilgamesh).[51] Identification of this pattern[52] enables us to view the Gilgamesh passage from a broader perspective. But when this is done we find that Gilgamesh conforms to the pattern imperfectly. On the one hand, the Urukites' complaint does not disturb the gods' sleep. And on the other, the consistent use of unequivocal terms for corvee in most of the other passages which really intend corvée simply highlights their complete absence in GE. These passages use the terms *ilku*, *dullu*, *abšannu*; Atrahasis uses the latter two plus *š/ṭupšikku*, *šipru*, and *iškaru*. None of these, nor other related terms such as *dikūtu*, *kudurru*, *zabbilu*, *allu*, *marru*, or the like appears in GE. On the other hand the Cyrus Cylinder and the "Vision of the Netherworld" show that the pattern is not limited to corvée but may occur with other types of oppression: in the Cyrus Cylinder various acts of sacrilege, and in the "Vision of the Netherworld" *ippiru*, *daṣāti*, and *saḫmašāti*, "distress, oppression, and disorders."[53]

A telling example of how much commentators would like to find a term for corvee in the GE passage is Oppenheim's interpretation of *i-kad-dir* in l. 13 as *i-kad-dar*$_x$, allegedly from the verbal base of *kudurru*, "earth basket; forced labor."[54] Akkadian does indeed have deverbal nouns of the type *purussu*. The semantic development posited by Oppenheim would be paralleled in the derivation of another term for earth basket, *zabbilu*, from the common verb *zabālu*, "carry." But the case is not so simple, since we are confronted on the one hand with a noun, *kudurru*, which is widely attested, and for which von Soden (*AHw* 499d) considers a Hurrian derivation possible, and on the other hand an alleged verbal root which is nowhere else attested. It seems more likely to assume that *kudurru*, like other terms for forced labor (*dullu*, *ṭupšikku*, *allu*, *marru*), began with the basic meaning of an implement used in agriculture or construction and developed by metonymy into a term for the (forced) labor in which it was used. Oppenheim's proposed etymology of GE's *ikaddir* (allegedly **ikaddar*) might have more hope if it were viewed as a denominative from the noun *kudurru* in its meaning of forced labor, much as the homonym *kudurru* II, "border," developed a denominative verb *kadāru* III, "delineate" *AHw*, 419b).[55] But in any case Oppenheim's suggestion is a counsel of desperation which to my mind simply highlights the difficulty of finding any term for corvée in the passage.

Other attempts to find such a meaning might be made. Thus the verb *tebû* (I,ii,10 and 22) can be used for being mobilized for the corvee,[56] while *w/muššuru* (lines 12,16,23,27) can be used of release from it.[57] But since these terms can be used for several other types of mobilization or distraint and release they are no evidence by themselves. In the Pennsylvania tablet of the OB version IV,17,[58] the signs DUB (so read by Langdon and Jastrow-Clay).SAK.KI.I were once taken as *ṭupšakki*, assumedly a bi-form of *ṭupšikku*, "workbasket; corvee labor;"[59] so the signs

XUM

were understood as recently as 1958 by von Soden,[60] as 1961 by Diakonoff,[61] and as 1966 by Schmokel.[62] However, *CAD Ṣ*, 132, following Landsberger, has corrected this reading on the basis of the photograph PBS X/3, pl. 70 to *paššur* (GIŠ.BANŠUR) *sak-ki-i*, "festival platter" (Landsberger: "festival table"[63]), and in view of the unusual form *ṭupšakku* would represent, the new reading ought to be accepted.

Finally, one might try to make a case for corvée on comparative grounds. We have referred above to certain similarities in the way Gilgamesh and Solomon and Rehoboam were remembered by later traditions. These similarities are part of a larger context of transition from "primitive democratic" to monarchic government which Mesopotamia, and, much later, Israel underwent. Enough similarities have been pointed out[64] between the two cultures in this stage of development to justify a hope that Biblical material might shed some light on our subject. The description of the oppression of Uruk is reminiscent of Samuel's famous description of the oppressive practices of kings in I Sam. 8:11-18:

> This will be the manner of the king who will reign over you: he will take your sons and put them in his chariots, and will make them his horsemen, and they shall run before his chariots. And he will appoint them as captains of thousands and captains of fifties, and to do his plowing and harvesting, and make him arms and chariot-equipment. He will

> take your fields, your vineyards, and your best olive yards, and give them to his servants. He will take a tenth of your seed and your vineyards and give them to his officers and servants. He will take your male and female slaves, your best young men (emend.: cattle) and asses and put them to his work. He will take a tenth of your flocks. And you shall become his slaves. And then you shall cry out because of the king you chose for yourselves, but the Lord will not answer you then.

It is striking to note how the oppression in this passage even concludes with an outcry to God, thus conforming to the pattern noted above. Since the sequence oppression-outcry must have been- and still is - a universal and natural one,[65] no literary relationship is necessarily implied (cf. also Ex. 1:11-14; 2:23-25; Deut. 26:6f.; etc.); it is the situations themselves whose similarity is underscored.

Since Samuel's warning is hypothetical (as far as Israel in his time was concerned[66]) it includes more types of oppression than does GE, which is written from a post-facto perspective. It includes conscription of "sons" for both military and agricultural service as well as manufacturing, and of "daughters" for other types of service. I. Mendelsohn noted the similarity of this warning to practices known from second millennium Ugarit and Alalakh[67] For our present purpose it is more important that similar practices are known from Mesopotamia itself.[68]

In mentioning the conscription of both sons and daughters the Biblical passage recalls Gilgamesh's not releasing "the son to his father...the daughter to her mother" (lines 12, 16) and raises the possibility that GE, too, refers to conscription of both sexes; further, it reminds us that the conscription even of the males need not have been limited to construction but might have included military or agricultural or other services.

We shall return to I Sam. 8 below, but for now we need only note that this approach, too, has not served to confirm the corvée theory of Gilgamesh's oppression of Uruk. I believe it fair to say that we have considered every possible argument in favor of this theory and have not found one which is truly encouraging.

B. *Jus primae noctis*

In spite of numerous difficulties in GEP IV, 22-39,[69] the passage upon which the *jus primae noctis* theory is based is clear enough to justify this theory:[70]

aššat šīmātim iraḫḫi	He cohabits with the betrothed[a] bride
šû panānumma	- he first,
mūtum warkānu	the husband (only) afterwards.

NOTE

[a] Lit. "destined," i.e., for someone else.

For us, however, the question is whether this theme is reflected in the description in GE I,ii. Oppenheim doubted this:[71]

> The Old Babylonian version seems to have accused the king

of claiming what is termed in medieval Europe *ius primae noctis*, while in the Nineveh version the interruption of sex-life, caused by the segregation of the male population, led to the complaint of the women. It is likely that the author introduced the old saga-motif of royal building-craze in order to avoid a motivation which would have fallen short of the moral and ideological standards of his public.[72]

The latter point is incorrect, since the Neo-Assyrian version (II,ii,44ff.) also contains a passage describing the *bīt emūtim* scene which describes the *jus primae noctis* in the OB version. But the rest of Oppenheim's remarks, which imply that there is no indication of the practice in I,ii,16, are harder to deny. That passage speaks not of an offense committed on the "first night," but of not releasing at all. Unfortunately the text is broken at the point where it identified to whom Gilgamesh does not release the "nubile girl."[73] Thompson restored *ummiša*, "(to) her mother;" Oppenheim, "their husbands;"[74] *CAD* "her lover."[75] On literary grounds Thompson's "her mother" seems most likely, in view of its counterpart "Gilgamesh does not release the son to his father" a few lines earlier (line 12); relating sons to fathers and daughters to mothers is a standard feature of ancient Near Eastern literature.[76] In our notes to the text, above, we have expressed doubt that in the next line (17) "the daughter of the warrior, the wife of the young man" continues the direct object of *ul umaššar*, "does not release," thus ruling out the possibility that Gilgamesh was confiscating wives, too. This is not, of course, certain. To judge from David's behavior with Bathsheba (II Sam. 11: 4) and Abraham's and Isaac's fears about the kings of Egypt and Gerar (Gen. 12: 11f.; 20: 11; 26: 7) such high-handed behavior by kings towards their subjects' wives must be considered a possibility.[77] One way or the other, however, there is no indication that what is being described refers to *jus primae noctis*. One might think of simply confiscating the girls and perhaps wives for Gilgamesh's harem.[78] One must admit that the text does not even specify that the purpose for which they are taken is sexual; as we have seen, the "law of the king" in I Sam. 8:11-18 suggests that the females as well as males could have been drafted for royal service. Without ruling this out, it is hard to believe, since the NA version did include the later *jus primae noctis* passage, that the latter is not at least part of what the text has in mind.

C. The Evidence of the Hittite Version

In the Hittite version the oppression of Uruk is condensed into two lines (I,11a-13b), of which only one and one half are clear: "Daily the ⌈young men of Uruk he kept on besting." This constitutes the earliest exegesis we have of our section, and as such deserves serious consideration. Since the Hittite version is quite abbreviated, the absence from it of motifs which have been thoughtpresent in the NA version does not

XUM

constitute evidence against those motifs; but the Hittite version can shed light on those features of the NA version which it does include. How, then, does the Hittite version of our passage accord with the canonical version?

The Hittite version implies an ongoing contest between Gilgamesh and the young men of Uruk. Now already in 1898 Jastrow had stated that Gilgamesh was apparently the conqueror of Uruk and that he had apparently triumphed over its warriors in single combat.[79] Jastrow's view has the advantage of coming from a time before Jensen had (correctly) interpreted GE I,i,9 as referring to Gilgamesh's building the wall of Uruk, and having thus resulted from a direct consideration of the text itself, free from the influence of the wall-building passage. Three additional pieces of evidence can be adduced in support of Jastrow's theory: (1) the obscurity of Gilgamesh's origins, reflected in the Sumerian King List's statement that his father was a lillu-demon, suggests that he may not have succeeded to the throne legally (Thompson[80] compares the late tradition in Aelian about Gilgamesh's obscure origins; see, however, the Excursus at the end of Ch. II); Shaffer suggests that Gilgamesh's filiation through Lugalbanda in the Sumerian and Akkadian epic compositions is a secondary, propagandistic development of the Ur III period;[81] (2) possible Elamite affinities of the name Gilgamesh;[82] (3) in the Hittite version, between the narrative of Gilgamesh's birth and the oppression of Uruk, there appears only the statement: "He roams through all the lands and comes to the city of Uruk."[83]

There is a parallel in Hittite literature to the motif of a contest in which the hero bests the young men of a city. In the Gurparanzahu tale Gurparanzahu defeats the men of Akkad in an archery contest.[84] It might be claimed that the Hittite version of Gilgamesh borrowed that motif from the Gurparanzahu tale rather than finding it in the Gilgamesh epic itself, so that the Hittite version is no evidence at all for the meaning of the Akkadian epic. However, since the setting of that tale is in Akkad, the story itself may go back to a Mesopotamian original,[85] thus obviating this objection. Be that as it may, the value of the Hittite version of Gilgamesh in this case lies more in its interpretive suggestiveness than in its possible attestation of some more original and explicit version of the Akkadian passage.

On this score the Hittite version accords perfectly with the import of GE I,ii,9, "the onslaught of his weapons has no equal,"[86] and the simile "like a wild ox" (line 8) also suggests combat (cf. I, iv, 38f., 45f., and GEP vi, 11,16;[87] Hammurapi terms himself *rīmum kadrum munakkip zāʾiri*, "wild bull who gores the foe," LH prologue iii, 7-9[88]); as does the verb *gašāru* in line 8[89]. This interpretation gives these phrases an integral place in the story, functioning as more than simply standard royal epithets. Following the lead of the Hittite version we must understand these lines to refer to an ongoing situation, "daily he kept on besting the young men of Uruk." This implies, as noted, constant matches with Uruk's young men, perhaps contests. This also accords perfectly with Enkidu's announced intention (I,iv, 47-v,3):

> I will challenge him [and will bo]ldly address him,
> [I will] shout in Uruk: "I am he who is mighty!
> [I am the] one who can alter destinies,
> [(He) who] was born on the steppe is mighty; strength
> he has."[90]

This accords especially with the fact that what transpires at Gilgamesh and Enkidu's first meeting is a wrestling match (GEP vi = GE II, ii, 46ff.).[91] This interpretation satisfies Jacobsen's methodological criterion that the oppression can be identified from what Enkidu in fact does to Gilgamesh; and it makes most pointed the gods' statement of their purpose in creating Enkidu (I,ii,32 and 2N-T79:4):

> *liš-ta-an-nu-ma* *Uruk*^{KI} *liš-tap-*[*ši*ḫ],
> "let them (i.e., Gilgamesh and Enkidu) fight[92] with
> each other, so that (the rest of) Uruk may have peace."

liš-ta-an-na-nu-ma also counters I,ii,9, where the same root *šananu* appears in *ul* *išû* *šaninamma* *tebû* $^{\text{GIŠ}}$ *kakkē*[*šu*] "the onslaught of his weapons has no equal."

A further detail in the epic which implies a contest between Gilgamesh and Enkidu has been suggested by Gadd. In a Middle Babylonian fragment of Enkidu's deathbed curse Enkidu refers to the hunter *ša la u-šam-ṣa-an-nu ma-la ib-ri-i*, "who did not allow me to find as much game as my friend."[93] Gadd took this to refer to a hunting contest between Gilgamesh and Enkidu.[94] This would imply that Gilgamesh was a lover of competition in general, and that he had been engaging the young men of Uruk in contests of several different types.

It is conceivable that the references to wrestling and athletics in honor of Gilgamesh in the Astrolabe and the Death of Gilgamesh can be related to this suggested "love of competition." Lambert suggested that the wrestling ceremonies were modeled (at least in later eyes) on Gilgamesh's fight with Enkidu.[95] But it is just as plausible that Gilgamesh was remembered as a competitor *par excellence* and was for that reason commemorated with such events.

Be that as it may, with his love of competition Gilgamesh embodies that "ambitious, competitive, aggressive, and seemingly far from ethical drive for pre-eminence and prestige, for victory and success" which Kramer sees as deeply rooted in Sumerian life.[96] Another personality who expressed these values in similar athletic feats was Shulgi (2094-2047), who boasted of his prowess in "wrestling and athletics" (gešpú, lirum) and running in at least two of his hymns, claiming that no one could measure himself with him.[97] Others have already noted the possibility that some elements in the Gilgamesh tradition were inspired by the Ur III kings,[98] and it is conceivable that Gilgamesh's athletic prowess and competitiveness are actually modeled on Shulgi's. But we cannot dismiss out of

XUM

hand the reverse possibility - that Shulgi strove, either as a literary fiction or in fact, to emulate his "brother" Gilgamesh.

It remains to be asked why Gilgamesh's demands that the young men of Uruk compete with him in contests should have been considered oppressive. Are we to assume that Gilgamesh's seizure of the sons and daughters of Uruk, described in the following lines (GE I,ii,11-17 = 21-28), is his prize for winning these contests? Some sort of contest of champions may be involved here[99] - these often result in the enslavement of the loser and those he represents to the victor[100] - although I do not wish to press this particular term too much. There are also many cases in folkloristic literature of contests in which the winner wins a bride,[101] the most famous example being the suitors' archery contest for Penelope in Book XXI of the Odyssey, to which some have compared the Gurparanzahu story.[102]

Unless we are to assume that the details of the oppression are unrelated to each other, some such contest theory seems the most plausible interpretation we can give to the oppression pericope. Such a theory accords with an interpretation of the pukku incident which has been advocated in recent years, so we shall now turn our attention to that.

D. The pukku incident.

In dealing with this passage we are confronted with one of the most difficult *cruces* in cuneiform literature. We cannot attempt a reinvestigation of the entire question here, but shall content ourselves with a survey of the most important views which have been expressed.

The crucial question is the meaning of *pukk/ggu*. Jensen left the word untranslated in our passage and took it to possibly mean "Fangnetz" in XII,1, etc. though he gave no other indication of considering the word in XII different from that in I.[103] This interpretation was advocated as late as 1930 by Thompson in commenting on I,ii,10.[104] But in 1933 S. Smith showed this interpretation to be fallacious,[105] and it has not been seriously advocated since.

Smith's own view was that both *pukku* and *mikkû* referred to musical instruments, specifically wind instruments.[106] By this time Gadd had published the first part of the Sumerian original of GE XII,[107] and Smith was able to point to the apparent interchangability there of $^{\text{GIŠ}}$E.AG (=*mikkû*) and KA.DI, allegedly a musical instrument that produces a sound called *taṣriḫtum*, and to the variant reading IM.DI, where the element DI could allegedly refer to a flute.

In the following year Landsberger's first opinion on the subject was mentioned by Ranoszek:[108] *pukku* was a percussion instrument, perhaps a drum, while *mikkû* was its drumstick.[109] A few years later F.W. Galpin, in his study *The Music of the Sumerians*,[110] endorsed Smith's view, adding some distant comparative philological evidence. In the most recent study of Sumerian music[111] *pukku* and *mikkû* are not mentioned - presumably they are not taken by its author as musical instruments.

The demise of this view is probably due largely to Landsberger himself, who withdrew this suggestion in 1960, noting that despite its wide acceptance he had never, in fact, proven it. He now suggested that *pukku* and *mikkû* were playthings, "hoop" and "stick" ("Reifen" and "Stecken") respectively.[112] A year later he adduced further evidence that the *pukku* was round and rollable; on this basis he suggested it might be a "Holzkugel," and the game in which it was used something like polo or croquet.[113]

Following this Jacobsen tentatively suggested that in the epic Gilgamesh

> keeps the young men of the town in service all the time, toughens them up with rough games and allows them no time for their families and sweethearts.[114]

If this suggestion should be combined with the evidence of the Hittite version, one would see here a contest in some game employing the *pukku*, in which Gilgamesh forced the young men to participate, and in which he constantly defeated them. Elsewhere in the epic it is wrestling and hunting contests in which Gilgamesh participates, while in I,ii,9 weapons are mentioned. Conceivably the *pukku* could have been used as a weapon,[115] but it is harder to reconcile it

XUM

with wrestling. So the most one can say is that several different types of contest may have been involved.

However, the view that the pukku is a musical instrument still has advocates,[116] among them van Dijk.[117] His argument is based on comparative-religious considerations. The ḫuluppu-tree, from which the pukku and mikkû are made, is, according to van Dijk, a "cosmic tree;" since in shamanism the shaman's drum is always made from the cosmic tree, van Dijk concludes that drum must be the meaning here. The incident involving the pukku was a frenzied dance around the cosmic tree, while the beating of the pukku was for the purpose of establishing contact with the dead. It would be difficult as well as unfair to attempt a full evaluation of van Dijk's view here, since for the most part I am dependent on notes from his oral presentation at Yale on May 2, 1968. For the present we can only express the view that van Dijk's comparative-religious argument awaits the support of philological evidence more appropriate than that offered by Galpin some years earlier.

The most recent first-hand study of the pukku incident in the Sumerian "Gilgamesh, Enkidu, and the Netherworld" is that of Shaffer. He translates the passage in question thus:[118]

151. He works the pukku, he brings it out in the broad square.

152. Working the '....', he brings out the '....' in the

broad square.

153. The young men of the city who were playing with the pukku,

154. He, a group of widow's children . . . ,

155. "Oh, my neck, oh, my hips," they lament.

156. He who has a mother, she brings her son bread.

157. He who has a sister, she pours out water for her brother.

158. After evening had come,

159. He drew a mark at the place where the pukku was set down.

160. His pukku, he carried before him and took it to his house.

161. At daybreak where he had drawn the mark,

162. At the widow's accusation,

163. At the young girl's outcry,

164. His pukku and his mikkû fell down to the realm of the netherworld.

Here are Shaffer's comments on the episode:

> "...we have a description of what is done with these objects in the city square, involving perhaps, a game or contest of sorts, but, this is highly problematical. The result, however, is discomfort and pain for a group of orphans, who set up a lament, perhaps complaints of thirst and hunger; those who have mothers and sisters

are given food and drink by them.

In the evening the place where the *pukku* is set at rest/comes to rest is marked, seemingly by Gilgameš, who carries it home. In the morning there is an 'accusation,' an 'outcry (to Utu for justice)' from the widows and young girls, whereupon the *pukku* and the *mekkû* fall into the netherworld.[119]

It is difficult to go beyond Shaffer's cautious statement. When one considers this and other interpretations which have been suggested for the Sumerian episode, a number of difficulties arise in attempting to relate them to the *pukku* passage in the Akkadian epic. How do these possibilities fit with the use of the preposition *ina* ("into?" "out of"?) and the verb *tebû* in GE i,ii,10: *ina puggišu tebû ru'ū[šu]*? Landsberger sensed these or some other difficulties and wrote, after proposing his interpretation of the Sumerian passage:

> I am not inclined to assume our word either in Gilg. I ii 10 = 22 or in [GE]P IV 30. The first passage: *ina puggišu tebû ru'ūšu*, "his companions stand (in readiness), awaiting his command"...[120]

This interpretation of *puggu* was already assumed by Muss-Arnolt in 1905.[121] Recently Grayson agreed that Landsberger's reading is possible for line 10, but not for line 22, "where the text reads: *ina pu-uk-ki šu-ut-bu-ú* [...]."[122] However, there can be no question but that lines 10 and 22 must be

XUM

harmonized by emendation, as Landsberger presumed and von Soden actually asserted.[123] The latter emended line 10's *te* to *ut*, yielding *šú/šu-ut-bu-ú* in both lines, but in view of the *šú* in line 10 it would seem more likely to construe that sign as a suffix than as the beginning of a word, where it is used far less frequently;[124] thus it seems preferable to us to emend line 22's *ut* to *te* and follow Landsberger's reading in both lines. But I do not believe Landsberger's interpretation would be seriously harmed by the alternative.

Landsberger's interpretation seems to fit the syntax and make the most sense out of the context. But what are we to make of the inevitable conclusion that the Sumerian passage does not mean the same thing as the Akkadian? We certainly cannot conclude that they are unrelated. For, as already suggested by Kramer,[125] in the Sumerian passage we have the ultimate source of the Akkadian epic's *pukku* motif. This is made certain not by the mere presence of the word *pukk/ggu* in both passages, but by a number of similar details. Not least of these is the episodes' concluding with an accusation and outcry (Sum. šu-dù-dù [GEN 162] and especially i-^{d}Utu [GEN 163] = *tazzimtu* [GE I,ii,18=29]) against Gilgamesh's behavior. Several other details seem tellingly similar, even if not identical: thus in GEN 153 the young men (guruš) of the city play with the *pukku* and a group of widows' children are hurt, while in GE I,ii, 10f. Gilgamesh's "companions" are involved

XUM

with puqqu and the "young men" of Uruk are somehow adversely affected by his behavior; in GEN 162f. it is the young girl and widow who protest against Gilgamesh, while in GE I,ii, 17f. =28f. it is, on our interpretation, the daughter of the warrior and the wife of the young man who protest; the involvement of children in the Sumerian episode and its mention of actions occurring at evening and daybreak recall the involvement of children and the "day and night" oppression of the Akkadian passage. These very details seem to confirm the ultimate relationship of the Sumerian and Akkadian passages, but the obvious differences point either to a radical evolution of the episode over centuries of literary transmission or to a serious misunderstanding of the Sumerian by the Akkadian author.[126] The Akkadian epic would seem to have preserved and even expanded the motif of athletic competition which may be present in the Sumerian original, but ironically, it misunderstood the very word, pukku, which stood at the center of that motif in the original.

E. Summary

With all due reserve we may summarize the results of our inquiry as follows: The most common theory of the oppression of Uruk, which holds that Gilgamesh forced the city to perform corvée labor, cannot be supported by the text itself. His demand for the jus primae noctis is clear in the second tablet and its Old Babylonian forerunner, and may be reflected in I,ii, as well. For what purpose Gilgamesh held the young men and women of Uruk cannot be stated, although some sort of service is plausible. It is possible that Gilgamesh came to Uruk as a conqueror, and that this status was involved in his oppression of the citizens. It seems clearer that he constantly fought them and demanded that the young men of the city engage in various types of athletic competition with him, possibly paying a heavy price when they lost. That price may have been the freedom of their sons and daughters, whom Gilgamesh won in these contests. A contest may have been described in the Sumerian original of the pukku episode, but that original appears to have been transformed or misunderstood in the Akkadian epic. There can be no doubt, however, that we have the ultimate source of the oppression, at least in part, in the pukku episode of "Gilgamesh, Enkidu, and the Netherworld." Not only the pukku motif itself but its outcome in a protest by the people of Uruk against Gilgamesh's behavior are found already in the Sumerian text.

NOTES TO CHAPTER IV

1. Jensen, *KB* VI/1, 424f; *Das Gilgamesch-Epos in der Welt-Literatur* I, 4; Weber, *Die Lit. der Bab. und Ass.*, 72; Rogers, *Rel. of Bab. and Ass.*, 195; *Cuneiform Parallels to the OT* (1912), 82; Ungnad, *Rel. Bab. und Ass.*, 68f.; Jeremias, *AO* 25, 22f.; Gadd *apud* Budge, *The Bab. Story of the Deluge...*, 41f.; Oppenheim, *Or*. 17, 21-23; Dossin, *Bull. Acad. Royale de Belgique* 42, 583; Korošec, *GSL*, 164; von Soden, *Propylaen Weltgeschichte* I, 541; Edzard in Haussig (ed.), *WbMyth*, 59, 72; Gordon, *The Ancient Near East*, 46; Bailkey, *Am. Hist. Rev.* 72, 1217; Kirk, *Myth*, 135.
2. Schott, *OLZ* 1933, 521f.; *ZA* 42, 95 *sub* 10.22 *pukku*; Oppenheim, *Or*. 17, 23; Ravn, *Bi*.*Or*. 10, 12f.; Otten, *Ist. Mit*. 8, 122; Lambert, *JEOL* 15, 195f.; *GSL*, 51; Schott-von Soden, *Das Gilg. Epos.*, 30n.; Korošec, *GSL*, 163; von Soden, *Propylaen Weltgeschichte* I, 541; Finkelstein, *JAOS* 90, 251f. Others refer more vaguely to sexual demands, e.g. Jacobsen, *Ac*.*Or*. 8, 62-74; Kramer, *JAOS* 64,9; Gordon, *The Ancient Near East*, 46; Kirk, *Myth* 135; Bailkey, *Am. Hist. Rev.* 72, 1217. The *jus primae noctis* theory was opposed by Ranoszek, *ZDMG* 88, 210; Landsberger, *Symbolae David* II, 83f.; doubted by Diakonov, *Bi*.*Or*. 18, 63; Kramer's reference to a sexual orgy (*JAOS* 64,9) also implies rejection of *jus primae noctis*.
3. Laessøe, *Bi*. *Or*. 13, 95f.; Saggs, *The Greatness...*, 384; Finkelstein, *Commentary* 26, 431-444; Lambert-Millard,

Atrahasis, 11; Jastrow, *ZA* 13, 288-301.

4. See above, Ch. I, C.

5. The reading An-àm is preferred for this name by Falkenstein, *BagM* 2, 35n. 155, while Kraus, *Bi.Or.* 22, 288f., favors Dingir-àm. For some other possibilities see Hallo, *Bi.Or.* 18, 14 *ad* 29.

6. Falkenstein, *BagM* 2, 18-22.

7. *SAKI*, 222:2b; Edzard, *ZZB*, 156 n. 831. (Prof. Hallo informs me that R.J. Tournay apprised him of the discovery of another version of this inscription.) Another tradition apparently considered the wall to have been built before the time of Gilgamesh; see Wilcke, *Lugalbandaepos*, 205.

8. *GSL*, 8. For zi-ga = "levy" see Poebel, *AS* 14, 71ff.; Falkenstein, *SAHG* 151f. (Gudea Cylinder A, 14:7-27): "Aufgebot." In Gilgamesh and the Land of the Living B, line 45 (unpubl. MS of Shaffer) the zi-ga imposed by Gilgamesh by Uruk is a military draft.

9. Sollberger, *JCS* 16, 42:6f.; cf. Lambert, *GSL*, 48; Kramer, *ibid.*, 61-63. Line 6 (Sollberger's numbering) is often understood to contain the name of the chapel, which is rendered N̄umun- or Šumunburra (e.g., Kramer, *GSL*, 61f. *CADE*, 109b). The text of lines 6f. reads ^{d}bil$_{4}$-ga-més dul ú-GUG$_{4}$-bur-ra / bára ^{d}en-líl-lá in-dù. Prof. Hallo proposes the rendering: "Gilgamesh built the chapel of Enlil on the hillock of *elpet mē purki/meburki*," the latter based on

[šu-mu-un]-búr = ú-GUG$_4$-búr-ra = *elpetum* *me*-[*e* *pur*-*ki*], or *me*[*purki*] (quoted in *CADE*, 108c, lex.); the term refers to a type of plant, the exact meaning being uncertain (see *CADE*, 109c; *AHw* 639d s.v. *meb/purkum*).

10. Lambert, *GSL*, 49 with reference to A. von Haller, *UVB* 7, 41-45; cf. the next note.

11. Von Soden, *Propylaen Weltgeschichte* I, 541: the walls were built by 2500, which fits Gilgamesh's date of about 2750; see the discussion of Matouš, *Bi*.*Or*. 21, 4f.; Hallo and Simpson, *The Ancient Near East: A History*, 46.

12. Jacobsen, *PAPhS* 107, 479; *ZA* 52, 120, with reference to Falkenstein, *CHM* I/4, 807.

13. Jacobsen, *PAPhS* 107, 479; *ZA* 52, 120.

14. Bright, *A History of Israel*, 199-203, 207-210; E. Neufeld, *HUCA* 31, 37-41; cf. Bailkey, *Am. Hist. Rev.* 72, 1211-1236.

15. Finkelstein, *PAPhS* 107, 461-472.

16. See Weidner, *MAOG* 4 (1929), 266; Nougayrol, *Annuaire, École Pratique des Hautes Édudes*, *Section des Sciences Religieuses*, 1944-45, 5-41; Goetze, *JCS* 1, 253-265. There are two other pre-Sargonic kings mentioned in omens, Am/Enmeluanna of Bad-Tibira and Etana of Kish (see Weidner, *op*. *cit*., 227f.). The very practice of extispicy is not yet attested as early as Gilgamesh's times (Second Early Dynastic Period; see n.11). The earliest evidence is from the time of Ur-Nanshe of Lagash (25th century, Third Early Dynastic Period), in the statement

that the consort of Nanshe was "chosen on a goat" (maš-bi pà; *SAKI*, 2,2a:3,4-6 = Sollberger, *Corpus*, Urn. 24: III, 4-6). The alleged reference to a "chief divination priest" (ugula-azu) in another Ur Nanshe text (*SAKI*, 6,h:1,3 and 2,3 = Sollberger, *Corpus*, Urn. 49: I,3 and II,3) which has been cited as further evidence for divination (e.g., Finkelstein, *PAPhS* 107, 464 n. 12) is to be interpreted otherwise (pa-zu$_x$, "your top" [Jacobsen, *JNES* 2, 117f.; for a closer parallel than that cited by Jacobsen see Šurpu IX, 2-4; pa-zu...úr-zu; the value zu$_x$ for AZU is now confirmed by Biggs, *RA* 60, 175f.]). However the same text contains another divination term, éš-bar-kin, "wise" or "oracular decision" (III,2), for which see Goetze, *Iraq* 22, 151f.; Sjöberg and Gragg, *TCS* III, 128 *sub* 416 and 181 *sub* 39; J. Klein, *JCS* 23, 121f. In view of this evidence it would not be surprising if omens were collected already in Gilgamesh's time, but it would remain to be proven, against all the evidence cited in the text above, that some of the Gilgamesh omens we have actually stem from his time.

17. *KAR* 434 and Rm 907; see Lambert, *GSL*, 44f.

18. *ZA* 42, 9.

19. *PAPhS* 107, 465 nn. 13, 17.

20. On possible Sargonic elements in the epic's picture see Matouš, *GSL*, 93; *Bi.Or.* 21, 5; V.K. Afanasjeva, *VDI* 87/1, 84ff. (Russian; ref. from Mamalat, *AS* 16, 373). But see the comment of Malamat, *AS* 16, 373.

21. *GSL*, 46.

22. *Ibid.*, 45.

23. Examples listed *ibid*.

24. Leichty, *TCS* IV, 46:II, 6.

25. E.G. Lambert, *GSL*, 45.

26. *AHw*,492c.

27. *TCS* IV, 211.

28. Cited in *AHw*, 492c.

29. Mostly quoted in *CADA*$_1$, 210b lex.

30. *KB* 6/1, 116f.:9.

31. Jastrow, *RBA* 473f.; Jeremias, *Izdubar-Nimrod*, 15f.

32. Ungnad, *RBA* 68f.; Rodgers, *Cuneiform Parallels*, 82; Oppenheim, *Or*. 17, 21; von Soden, *Prop. Weltgesch.* I, 541; Bailkey, *Am. Hist. Rev.* 72, 1217.

33. *Or*. 17, 21.

34. Ungnad-Gressmann, *Das Gilgamesch-Epos*, 87 n. 1.

35. *CT* 46, 19: BM 34248, line 7.

36. Grayson, *ANET*^{3}, 503d.

37. *Act*. *Or*. 8, 62-74.

38. *Ibid.*, 63f.

39. *Ibid.*, 64 n. 3.

40. As noted by Oppenheim, *AM*, 260.

41. *Ibid.*, 120-125; with reference to GE: *Or*. 17, 21 n. 1. The *locus classicus* for this status is the Fürsten-

spiegel, *BWL*, 112-115: 23-30, 55-59.

42. Oppenheim, *AM*, 120.

43. Adapa, fragment D:10 (*ANET*,102d; cf. Speiser's n. 12 there.).

44. This is *CAD*'s second type of *andurāru*; see examples listed in *CADA*$_2$, 117c. For the Lipit-Ishtar code see Evans, *JAOS* 83, 20ff. On the institution in general see J. Lewy, *Eretz Israel* 5, 23*ff.; Finkelstein, *JCS* 15, 104 n. 19; further bibliography in *CAD*, *loc. cit.*

45. King, *STC* II, pl. 73f.; I, 219f.

46. *JBL* 74, 329f., n. 7.

47. *ANET*, 315f.

48. Cf. Weinfeld, *JNES* 23, 202-212.

49. Translation from Oppenheim, *ANET*, 315. Compare to Marduk's reaction the threat in the Fürstenspiegel, *BWL* 114:55-59.

50. *ANET*, 109f.; Heidel, *GE*^{2}, 132-136.

51. For a discussion of the motif of noise disturbing the sleep of the gods see Pettinato, *Or.* 37, 184-198; against the latter's interpretation of the motif in Atrahasis see Moran, *Biblica* 52, 51-61. Depriving the gods of sleep is not in every case evil; see curse of Agade 24, *ZA* 57, 51; note also Erra IV, 51 where the *dekū Eanna*, "awakeners of Eanna," are probably cultic officials who awaken Ishtar each morning (cf. Jewish and Egyptian counterparts discussed by S. Lieberman, *Hellenism in Jewish Palestine*, 142 f.)

52. The pattern occurs also in the creation account in Enki and

XUM

Ninmaḫ (van Dijk, *Ac. Or.* 28, 24-30); cf., in a non-creation context, Lugal-e VIII, 1-6 (Radau, *BE* 29/I, no. 2=3:1-6).

53. So Speiser in *ANET*; cf. *CAD* D, 118d:"disturbance, dishonesty and rebellion," 1/J, 165b: "troubles," etc.).

54. *Or.* 17, 22 n. 4.

55. For the noun type *purussu* see GAG §55q. For *zabbilu* and *zabālu* see *CADZ*, s. vv. and Held, *JAOS* 88, 90-96. For another denominative verb from a noun meaning "forced labor" cf. perhaps *CADD*, 47c (*dalālu* B from *dullu*?).

56. Note the use of *šutebû* for mobilization in Fürstenspiegel line 23, as emended by Diakonov in *VDI* 1946/4 (cf. *RA* 44, 101); *AS* 16, 348; cf. *BWL*, 112n: see also *ARM* II, 101:7f.

57. F.R. Kraus, *SD* V, 45 *sub* B; cf. En. El. VI, 34.

58. *PBS* X/3, 216:17 = *YOS* IV/3, 66:147.

59. Held, *JAOS* 88, 95; von Soden, *Or.* 38 (1969), 420 n. 1; Salonen, *Bi.Or.* 27, 176f.

60. Schott-von Soden, *Das Gilg. Epos*, 30:147: "Ziegelkörbe" - but in italics.

61. *Bi.Or.* 18, 62.

62. *Das Gilgamesch-Epos*, 38:24

63. *Symbolae David* II, 83 with n. 1, 104 bottom; Landsberger notes von Soden's rejection of this reading on 82f. For the etymology of *sakku* (< Sum. zag) and another view of its meaning see A. Salonen, *Möbel*, 182, 190.

XUM

64. See the literature cited by Tadmor, CHM 11 (1968), 2 with nn. 5 and 7 (but Tadmor does not accept all the conclusions of these studies - see ibid., 13)

65. For the outcry of the oppressed in non-literary texts cf. UMBS V, no. 74:VI, 14-VII, 17 (Kraus, JCS 5, 35f.); TCL 15, no. 9:v, 27f. (CADI/J, 144a lex.); ARM 1, 6:34. For a Biblical example see II Ki. 8:3.

66. Mendelsohn showed that the warning was not necessarily late and based on Israel's actual experiences with kingship (BASOR 143, 17-22).

67. Ibid.

68. Cf. Oppenheim, AM, 120f.

69. Cf. Dossin, Le Pâleur d'Enkidou and the review of Schott, OLZ 1933, 519-522; Ravn, Bi.Or. 10, 12f. and Ac.Or. 22, 46f.; Landsberger in Symbolae David II, 82-84, and the review of Finkelstein, JAOS 90, 251f.

70. The objections of Ranoszek, ZDMG 88, 210, are too vague to be debated; that of Diakonov, Bi.Or. 18, 63, is subject to the same criticism as that of Landsberger, Symbolae David, 82ff., in that by making Gilgamesh's behavior lawful it leaves Enkidu's anger unexplained (Finkelstein, JAOS 90, 251).

71. Diakonov, Bi.Or. 18, 62f. also sees a difference between the two passages.

72. Or. 17, 23.

73. CADB, 173d; not "women," as Oppenheim held (Or. 17, 22 n. 7).

The motif of releasing sons and daughters to their parents calls to mind the literal meaning of the Sumerian equivalent of *andurāru*, namely ama-ar-gi$_{(4)}$, "returning to the mother." In view of such passages as the Urnammu hymn *TCL* 15, 12: III, 56 (Castellino, *ZA* 53, 122; cf. Letter Prayer B$_1$, last line), where ama-ar...gi$_4$-gi$_4$ is used as a finite verb, this etymology deserves to be taken seriously (see Hallo, *Bi.Or.* 16, 236, with reference to Edzard, *ZZB*, 95f.)

74. *Or.* 17, 22.
75. *CADB*, 173d.
76. Cf. Keret B (=*UT* 128), iii, 23f.: "the sons of Keret... the daughters of Hurriya...;" Ruth 1:8; Cant. 3:4; 8:2; Gen. 24:28; cf. also Cassuto, *The Goddess Anath* (Heb.), 36f. For Akkadian examples Prof. Hallo calls my attention to Erra IIc, 33f.; III, 9f.; cf. Atrahasis S:v, 18-21 = vi, 7-10.
77. Skinner, *Genesis* (*ICC*), 249, considers such behavior typical of "Oriental despotism."
78. Cf. Deut. 17:17. Others speak more generally of "taking girls for himself" (Gordon, *The Ancient Near East*, 46; Kirk, *Myth*, 135) or Gilgamesh's "Rabelaisian sex appetite" (Kramer, *History Begins at Sumer*, 184).
79. *RBA* 473f.; also *YOR* IV/1, 27, 30.
80. *GETh*, 9f.
81. Jacobsen, *AS* 11, 90f.:18; cf. Shaffer, 11.
82. Cf. Lambert in *GSL*, 47.
83. Lines 10f.; cf. Otten, *Ist. Mit.* 8, 120.

84. Güterbock, *ZA* 44, 86f.: 18'-23'.

85. *Idem*. in Kramer (ed.), *Mythologies of the Ancient World*, 154; cf. Gurney, *The Hittites*, 194.

86. For parallels to this epithet see Seux, *Épithètes*..., s.vv. *šanānu* and *tebû*.

87. For a Ugaritic parallel to these lines cf. IAB (=*UT* 49): vi, 17-18.

88. Lipit-Ishtar uses a similar epithet with the same nuance, *SKIZ* 30:9.

89. Cf. *CADG*, 56ab for examples with this overtone.

90. Speiser's translation (*ANET*, 75).

91. On the wrestling match see Oppenheim, *Or*. 17, 29f.; Gordon, *JNES* 7, 264; *Iraq* 6, 4f.; Ravn, *Ac*.*Or*. 22, 47; Offner, RA 56, 31-38; opinions are expressed more briefly by Gadd *apud* Budge, *The Babylonian Story of the Deluge*, 43; Kramer, *JAOS* 64, 9; Jastrow-Clay, *YOR* IV/3, 34f.: Jacobsen, *Ac*.*Or*. 8, 7; Saggs, *The Greatness*..., 373.

92. So this passage was understood by Delitzsch, *Ass.Hwb.*, 676b; Muss-Arnolt, 1074b; Stamm, *As*. *Stud*. 6, 6.

93. Gadd, *Iraq* 28, 109:6; so translated also by Grayson, *ANET*^{3}, 506a.

94. *Op*. *cit*., 107.

95. *GSL*, 56.

96. Kramer, *The Sumerians*, 264-268.

97. Shulgi A (*ANET*^{3}, 585f.), 36-78; Shulgi C rev. 3', 11'-14',

19' (numbering according to unpubl. MS of Hallo) = STVC 50 rev. 3, 13, 14 cited by Landsberger, WZKM 57 (1961), 22 sub "Zu 2. S. 116;" for lines 12'-14' see already van Dijk, Bi. Or. 11, 87.

98. See Matouš, Bi.Or. 21, 5.

99. This possibility was raised in connection with the fight between Gilgamesh and Enkidu by Hoffner, CBQ 30, 220 n. 1.

100. E.g., Enuma Elish IV-V;I Sam. 17:9; see de Vaux, Biblica 40 (1959), 495-508.

101. Stith Thompson, Motif-Index, H326.1.2; 331.2; 331.4; 335.4.3.

102. Forrer, quoted by Güterbock, ZA 44, 88f.; Barnett, Journal of Hellenic Studies 65, 100f.; but see the remarks of Güterbock, op. cit., 89.

103. KB VI/1, 521.

104. GETh. 72, sub 10.

105. RA 30, 162f.

106. Ibid., 153-168.

107. RA 30, 127-143; abbreviated below as GEN.

108. ZDMG 88, 210.

109. Accepted by Schott-von Soden (in Das Gilg. Epos), Speiser (in ANET), von Soden (Or. 16, 87; AHw 642d, 878a), Kramer, JAOS 64, 20 n. 8; van Dijk, in Hartman (ed.), Syncretism, 174.

110. Pp. 21-25.

111. H. Hartmann, Die Musik der Sumerischen Kultur. The Handbuch

der Orientalistik fascicle on music by H. Hickmann and W. Stauder is not yet available to me.

112. *WZKM* 56, 124-126; Grayson, *ANET*^{3}, 507 translates "Reifen" as "wheel."

113. *WZKM* 57, 23; cf. also Gordon, *JCS* 12, 62 sub 5.93.

114. Jacobsen expressed this opinion in his ACLS Lectures on the History of Religions for the year 1966; I quote from the unofficial record published in J. Neusner (ed.), *Report of the 1965-1966 Seminar on Religions in Antiquity* (Dartmouth College Comparative Studies Center, September, 1968), 81.

115. Cf. the proverb "He became angry like a dog which had been struck by a block of wood" ($^{\text{GIŠ}}$ELLAG = *pukku* [*MSL* II, 128:9]), Gordon, *JCS* 12, 62, no. 5.93.

116. M. Schneider, *Antaios* 9, 262-283; cf. V. Schneider, *Gilgamesch*, 82-93.

117. In S.S. Hartmann (ed.), *Syncretism* (1969), 174.

118. Shaffer, 105f.

119. *Ibid.*, 31f.

120. *WZKM* 56, 125 n. 49 (my translation); cf. Grayson, *ANET*^{3}, 503.

121. W. Muss-Arnolt, *A Concise Dictionary of the Assyrian Language*, II, 819b. The lexical evidence for this meaning is found in Diri III, 65-70 (Meissner, *AS* 4, 89):

gi-iz-zal : giš.zal ...: *ḫa-si-su*
ni-iš-mu-u
qu-ú-lu

XUM

ga-a-lu

ú-te-qu-u

pu-uk-ku (poss. var.: [pu-uq-q]u).

Cf. Smith, RA 30, 156-158; Jacobsen in Gordon, SP, 466f. sub line 143. See now AHw 879 cd s.v. puqqu.

122. ANET^3, 503.

123. ZA 59, 221.

124. All the examples quoted in von Soden-Röllig, Das Akkadische Syllabar, 58, no. 296, are third person masc. sg. suffixes.

125. JAOS 64, 20.

126. Due to the similarity of pukku and puqqu. For misunderstanding of Sumerian texts by Akkadian scribes note the mistranslations sometimes found in the Akkadian part of bilingual texts (cf. Falkenstein, LSSNF 1, index [p. 102] s.v. Akkadische Übersetzung, Fehler der).

Ch. V. Literary Antecedents and Affinities of the Creation of Enkidu

It was mainly on the basis of the similar Biblical account of the creation of Adam that Jastrow sought to demonstrate that the creation of Enkidu reflected an account of the creation of man. However, noting that Enkidu was created by Aruru, he also referred[1] to another cuneiform text in which Aruru played a role in the creation of man:

> ^{d}MIN *(=Aruru) zēr amēlūti ittišu ibtanu*
>
> Aruru created the seed of mankind with him (Marduk).[2]

The immediately preceding lines state that the chief role in the creation of man was Marduk's:

> (line 17: ^{d}AMAR.UD)...(19) *amēlūti ibtani*
>
> Marduk...created mankind.[3]

Jastrow argued that Marduk's presence in this text was simply introduced "by the theologians of Babylon who could not afford to ignore their patron god,"[4] and that the account naming Aruru, as well as the account of Enkidu's creation, reflect an Uruk tradition of creation.[5] The same view was expressed more recently by van Dijk.[6] Neither, however, argued for the literary dependence of the creation of Enkidu on that text. These texts have in common only the common theological motif of Aruru as the mother-goddess,[7] which by itself is no sign of literary relationship.

Another motif in the creation of Enkidu which is paralleled elsewhere is his creation from clay (*ṭiṭṭu*, I,ii, 34f.).

This is paralleled in Atrahasis, where the mother-goddess is involved again (Atrahasis I, 189-289),[8] in the Sumerian forerunner of the latter, Enki and Ninmah,[9] as well as several other cuneiform texts[10] and the Bible.[11] But here, too, while the parallel motifs have been noted, this has not led to a suggestion of literary dependence.

What has not been noted is the verbal similarity between certain lines in the creation of Enkidu in the Gilgamesh Epic and the creation of man in Atrahasis. Most striking is the nearly identical address instructing the mother-goddess to create respectively, Enkidu and mankind:

GE I,ii,30f.	Atrahasis I, 194f.
attī ^{d}*Aruru* *tabni* [*amēla*]	*attīma* *šassūru* *bāniat* *awēlūti*
eninna *binī* *zikiršu*	*binīma* *lullâ*...
You, Aruru, created [the man/ mankind[12]]:	You (are) the womb/creator-goddess,[13] creatress of mankind:
Now create his *counterpart*	Create man[14]...

The command in Atrahasis is followed immediately by the statement of purpose: *lībil* *abšānam*, "that he may bear the yoke" i.e., of the gods' labor,[15] thus establishing the gods' freedom (*andurārum*, Atrahasis I, 243). Corresponding to this in GE is the statement of the ultimate purpose of Enkidu's creation in the next part of the address to Aruru: *Uruk* *lištapšiḫ*, "that Uruk may have ea[se]" (GE I,ii, 32) - i.e., from the tyranny of Gilgamesh.

Once this correspondence is noted, a structural similarity between the first part of Atrahasis and the events culminating in the creation of Enkidu becomes apparent: Each pericope opens with oppression; the victims then complain to the gods; the mother-goddess then creates, at the gods' command, (a) man to relieve the victims of their suffering. Beyond the parallelism of structure there are a number of similar details, as the following chart shows:

GE I,ii	*Atrahasis I*
7-16 Urukites oppressed by Gilgamesh day and night	1-38 Igigi oppressed by Anunnaki, forced to labor day and night
17-29 Complaint (*tazzimtu*) of women of Uruk brought to [Anu], who is (by inference) sympathetic	39-191 Igigi complain (*uttazamu*), then go to Enlil; complaint eventually communicated to Anu and Enki, who are sympathetic
30a Gods summon mother-goddess: ^{d}*Aruru issû rabītu*	192f. Gods summon mother-goddess: *iltam issû išālu* *tabsūt ili erištam* ^{d}*Mami*
30b-31a Instruct her to create a man: *attī* ^{d}*Aruru tabni [amēla]* *eninna binī zikiršu* (Enkidu later described as *lullû-amēlu*, I,iv,6,13,19)	194 f. Instruct her to create mankind: *attīma šassūru bāniat awīlūti* *binīma lullâ*...
31b-32 State purpose:	195b-197 State purpose:

ana ūm libbišu lū ma[ḫir/šil?] *lištananūma Uruk lištap[šiḫ]*	......*lībil abšānam* *abšānam lībil šipir ^{d}Enlil* *šupšik ilim awīlum liššī* (corresponding passages in En.El. [VI,8,26,131,135; VII, 10] use *pašāḫu*)
33 b Mother-goddess makes plans or preparations	198-219 Gods make plans
34a Mother-goddess washes hands	221f. Enki makes purifying bath
	225f. Mother-goddess mixes clay
34b Mother-goddess nips off clay: *ṭiṭṭa iktaris*	256 Mother-goddess nips off clay: *[k]irṣi...uktarriṣ*
34c Mother-goddess spits on clay: *ittadi ina ṣēri*	233f. Gods spit on clay: *ru'tam iddû elu ṭiṭṭi*
35 Mother-goddess creates Enkidu	S obv.iii, 8-13 Birth-goddesses create seven couples

The Hittite version (H) of the creation of Enkidu also preserves details similar to the Atrahasis creation narrative, and in some places is even closer to Atrahasis than the canonical version of Gilgamesh is. There, too, the mother-goddess (^{d}MAḪ) is the creatress (H,13, etc.) The reference there to the assembly (H,18) corresponds to the assembly of the gods in Atrahasis at which the decision to create man was made (Atrahasis I, 218). The mother-goddess declares that she has created man before actually doing so (H, 20), as she does in Atrahasis (I, 237-243). She mixes clay before creating

Enkidu (II, 21), as the gods do in Atrahasis (I, 226). The Hittite version assures the existence of this pericope at least as early as the Middle Babylonian period, and along with the Old Babylonian material surveyed in Ch. II,C, creates a strong presumption for its existence in the Old Babylonian version. What is more, it suggests that the latter version was closer in many respects to Atrahasis than the later canonical version is.

What is the likelihood of a literary dependence of the creation of Enkidu on Atrahasis? In spite of the similarities, structural and detailed, apparent in the chart above, there are obviously numerous differences. The question of dependence rests on whether the similarities are so commonplace as to requite no direct relationship, or whether there are unusual, unexpected similarities which cannot be supposed to have occurred spontaneously.

Some features shared by the two texts are commonplace, as we have seen: creation by the mother-goddess and creation from clay. Others seem very general, containing no or only a few verbal correspondences, such as planning, purifying, nipping (*karāṣu*) off clay, spitting ([*ru'tam*] *nadû*), creating. But several other similarities are unique - on the basis of present evidence - to the Gilgamesh Epic and the Atrahasis Epic or to the circle of traditions to which Atrahasis belongs. These include the creation's being in response to an outcry of oppressed subjects and its purpose in relieving their suffering.

This pattern, culminating in the creation of a deliverer, is unique to the Gilgamesh Epic and creation texts, of which Atrahasis and perhaps its Sumerian forerunner Enki and Ninmah are the *loci classici*. Outside of these contexts the closest parallel is found in such passages as the Cyrus cylinder, where Cyrus is sent by Marduk as a deliverer in response to the outcry of the oppressed Babylonians.[16] But there the new hero is sent, not created, and he defeats and replaces the oppressor, rather than simply "contending" with him and diverting him.

Most impressive, however, are the very similar addresses to the mother-goddess. Even here it is just possible to conceive of a non-Atrahasis model for the address. Just as we have incantations to aid difficult births,[17] and others to relieve male impotence,[18] so there must have been incantations to relieve female barrenness[19] and perhaps simply to implore divine aid in conception. We know that incantations often referred to the addressed gods' past achievements in the course of requesting a repetition of those.[20] It is quite plausible that a line such as "you, Aruru, created mankind: now create a child" could be found in such a prayer. For example, the incantation to the river known as *attī nāru* opens with the address *attī nāru bānat kalama*, "you are the river, creatress of all."[21] But if the address to Aruru in GE is modeled on such a prayer, this must be true of Atrahasis I, 194f. as well. To deny interdependence of the two passages one must believe

XUM

that these two compositions independently borrowed several details of the creation process from creation texts, similar addresses to the mother-goddess from, perhaps, a prayer for childbirth, and the pattern oppression-outcry-creation of (a) deliverer(s). This taxes credibility. One must rather assume, at the very least, a source common to both texts, in which these elements had already been brought together. But since most of the common details as well as the pattern are most frequently attested as a group in creation literature, to which genre Atrahasis belongs, ultimate inspiration must come from that genre, if not from Atrahasis itself.

Future discoveries may someday bring us a model which is more similar to Gilgamesh. But recalling that the eleventh tablet of the Gilgamesh Epic drew upon the flood story, whose locus classicus in Akkadian literature is Atrahasis III, we may confidently expect that the ultimate model will be no farther removed from Atrahasis than the source of Gilgamesh XI is from the Atrahasis version of the flood.[22]

Further support for our conclusion that the creation of Enkidu is modeled on the creation of mankind is found in the next chapter, in which the model for Enkidu's early life is found in the early life of mankind.

NOTES TO CH. V

1. *RBA*, 474, 448; *AJSL* 15, 199f.

2. King, *CT* 13, 36:21; cf. *CADZ*, 96d *sub* 5a; van Dijk, *Act. Or.* 28, 19 n. 44; Heidel, *BG*^{2}, 63:21. For "seed of humanity" = "humanity" see Jensen in *RLA* I, 33. The Sumerian reads ^{d}A-ru-ru numun ki-min (=nam-lú-u$_{x}$-lu) AN-da bí-in-mú. King read AN-da as dingir-ta (better:da), "with the god" (followed by Heidel, *op. cit.*, 63 n. 13), van Dijk as An-da, "together with An (?...)..." (*loc. cit.*). In either case the Akkadian rendering "with him," with the obvious antecedent "Marduk," is at best imprecise, undoubtedly due to the uncertain meaning of the Sumerian (to refer to Marduk as "the god" seems pointless, while reference to An as the creator contradicts the previous line's reference to Marduk). However, this is not the place to go into the meaning of the Sumerian column, since we only quote the passage because of Jastrow's reference to it.

3. King, *CT* 13, 36: 17,20; cf. *CADZ*, 96d *sub* 5a; A$_{2}$, 58 lex. The Sumerian reads: ^{d}GI.LIM.MA... nam-lú-u$_{x}$-lu ba-dù.

4. *AJSL* 15, 199.

5. *RBA* 448.

6. *Ac.Or.* 28, 24.

7. On Aruru see E. Ebeling, *RLA* I, 160; Zimmern, *ZANF* 5 (1930), 252f.; Edzard in Haussig (ed.), *WbMyth*, 105; for a new example see Hallo, *17^{e} RAI*, 124:8.

8. Otten (*Ist. Mitt.* 8, 120f.) discusses the differences between the OB and NA versions of Atrahasis on this point.
9. Van Dijk, *Ac. Or.* 28, 26:33; see 30 n. 77.
10. *BWL* 88:277; Heidel, *BG*^{2}, 65:26.
11. Gen. 2:7; Job. 33:6.
12. Like *amēlūtu*, *amēlu* can also mean "mankind," as in, e.g., Atrahasis I,1.
13. Cf. Lambert-Millard, *Atrahasis*, 57: V obv. 1, etc.
14. For the meaning "primordial man" see below, Ch. VI.
15. Cf. Atrahasis I, 191, 197, 240, etc.
16. Cf. Judges 3:9 and passim; I Sam. 12:8-11.
17. W.G. Lambert, *Iraq* 31, 31f., 34f.
18. R.D. Biggs, ŠÀ.ZI.GA: *Ancient Mesopotamian Potency Incantations* (*TCS* II; 1967); H. Hoffner, *JBL* 85 (1966), 326-334.
19. Cf. Gen. 25:21; I Sam. 1:10f.
20. O. Eissfeldt, *The Old Testament: An Introduction* (Eng. tr. 1965), 112; W.G. Kunstmann, *Die Babylonische Gebetsbeschwörung* (LSS NF 2; 1932), 12; cf. Lambert, *Iraq* 31, 31ff.
21. The most complete text is *STT* I, 72:77. The title is quoted in the ritual text *KAR* 294:5 (Ebeling, *Tod und Leben*, 91:5).
22. Laessøe, *Bi. Or.* 13, 96; cf. Kramer, *JAOS* 64, 19 n. 87.

XUM

CH. VI. Literary Antecedents and Affinities of Enkidu's Early Life

A. Amorites

Stock descriptions about the Amorite way of life in the Ur III period[1] do bear some resemblance to the description of Enkidu. The subject matter of these descriptions includes the Amorites' habitat, shelter, diet, and dress, and the phraseology generally includes a reference to "not knowing" (Sum. nu-zu, Akk. *lā idû/idî*) some feature of civilization. The fullest statement is found in the Sumerian composition "The Marriage of ^{d}MAR.TU"[2] where the latter, the eponymous deity of the Amorites, is described in a difficult passage as:

Rev. ii, 24. za-lam-gàr-ti, IM-IM-šèg-[ga]...siskur-siskur-[ ]
25. ḫur-sag-gá tuš-e[a]......[b][ ]
26. lú uz[u]-diri kur-da mu-un-ba-al-la dùg-gam-nu-zu-àm
27. uzu-nu-šeg$_6$-gá al-kú-e
28. u$_4$-ti-la-na é nu-tuku-a
29. u$_4$-ba-ug$_x$(BAD)-a-na ki-nu-túm-mu-dam

24. A tent-dweller [buffeted (?)] by wind and rain...
25. Dwelling in the mountain...
26. The one who digs up mushrooms at the foot of the mountain, who does not know how to bend the knee;[c]
27. Who eats uncooked meat;
28. Who in his lifetime does not have a house;
29. Who on the day of his death will not be buried.

NOTES

a. Cf. ḫur-sag-gá tuš-a, cited by Buccellati, 331.

b. Kramer's reading (*Genava* NS 8, 281 n. 34) ki-tuš is not supported by the copy in *SEM* 58, rev. iv, 25.

c. Roux (*Anc. Iraq*, 161) adds interpretively: "(to cultivate the land)," while Chiera (*SRT*, p. 20:24) took the phrase to mean "he knows no submission" (cf. ...*matāti šarrāni*... *ša kanāša lā idû*, "lands of kings...who/which do not know submission," *AKA*, 64: iv, 51 [Tiglath-pileser I], cited *CAD* I/J 28c, translated *ARAB* I, 81; *ṣābē huršāni lā kanšūti*, "unsubmissive mountain peoples," *OIP* 2, 64:20 ([Sennacherib], cited *CADṢ*, 52a). Civil: "restless" (*apud* E. Reiner in *Languages and Areas*...119 n. 7; cf. *ANET*^{3} 586:59).

Several texts speak of the Amorite's home in the mountains;[3] others state that he "does not know/has never known a house,"[4] The statement that "he does not know grain" is frequent.[5] One text terms the Amorites lú ḫa-lam-m[a] dím-ma ur-ra-gin$_x$ ur-bar-ra-gin$_x$, "a people plotting destruction, like beasts, like wolves..."[6] A later text suggests the Amorites' dress:

> [mar-tu-g]in$_x$ edin-na kuš mi-ni-[in-lá]:
> *kīma a-mur*! (text BA)*-ri-i ina ṣēri* [*maška raksāku*]
> I have tied a skin around myself in the steppland like an Amorite.[7]

At first sight it is tempting to relate these passages to GE's description of Enkidu as one who "knows neither people

XUM

nor (civilized) land;" he is "garbed in a garment like Sumuqan" (I,ii,38), "a fellow who has come from the hills" (iii, 2 and parallels), who "knows not" the eating of (human) food (GEP iii, 6f.). But closer scrutiny brings out significant differences. While the Amorite eats uncooked meat, Enkidu eats grass (GE I, ii, 39). Most features in Enkidu's description are not found in the literary tradition about the Amorites. Most importantly, Enkidu is pictured as living with and like wild animals[8] (cf. GE VIII, 2ff., quoted above, end of Ch. II, A, 3) while the Amorites, on the contrary, are described, with the exception of the animal simile just quoted, as primitive bedouins living in tents. Enkidu becomes not only "civilized" but "humanized"[9] (*awēliš iwē*, GEP 105). The description of Enkidu is unlikely therefore, to have been modeled on the Amorites.

B. Curses

Parallels to a few details of the description of Enkidu where the similarity to animals is explicit may be found in curse formulas and in laments - provenances which testify to a view that these conditions are misfortunes. One Sumerian curse expresses the wish that "like a sheep (An) may gather grass for (the enemies') mouth to eat, may give their throat water to drink."[10] In the lament for Nippur it is said that when Nippur was destroyed "the black-heads ate all (sorts of) grass like sheep."[11] An obscure passage in the later text K7268[12] which belongs to the dingir.dib-ba rituals[13] reads:

> "What are my sins? [ ];
> What is my wrong? [ ];
> I am an ox, I eat grass [ ]
> I am a sheep, I [ ]..."[14]

Comparisons to animals are in fact quite common in laments; these similes express different types of suffering and debasement, including loss of intelligence.[15] Especially striking is this passage from a lament in a letter prayer: gud ^{giš}šudul-a nu-ub-ḫa-za lá-a-gin$_x$ edin-e ba-àb-du-dè-en, "like an ox, tied to a rope which it cannot bear, I wander about on the steppe."[16] The curse sections of Middle Babylonian *kudurrus* refer to the violator being driven from society (due to leprosy) and roaming the steppe like a wild animal (*umām ṣēri*) or a wild ass (*sirrimu*; cf. GE VIII obv. 2) or gazelle (MAŠ.DÀ, cf. GE I, ii, 39).[17] To the mention of Enkidu's hair one might compare, albeit from a much later source and without comparison to animals, the length of Ahiqar's hair (and nails) after his long incarceration in the Tale of Ahiqar;[18] from earlier times one might even cite references to sages, gods, young women, and demons letting their hair hang loose (sig-bar-ra...du$_8$ = *pērtam wuššuru*; cf. the description apparently of Enkidu in GE II, iv, 6: *uš-šur-tu$_4$ pe-re-tu*).[19] Finally, since Enkidu's qualities are the embodiment of ignorance (*lā idî*, GE I, ii, 38; GEP iii, 6; *lā lummud*, GEP iii, 9) we may compare the complaint in Sum. Letter Prayer H:25:na-gá-aḫ-šè ba-ku$_4$-re-en,"I have been turned into an ignoramus,"[20] and the curse expressed in the epilogue of the Laws of Hammurapi: loss of intelligence and understanding (*uznam u nēmeqam*).[21]

We do not find these curses in a single context, but rather scattered around separately. It is not inconceivable that the picture of Enkidu was created by the gathering of these clichés - this is a method of composition known elsewhere in the ancient Near East and Europe.[22] But it is problematic that the picture should have been drawn largely from punitive contexts. Why would the poet have wished to call up such punitive associations in his description of Enkidu?

C. Primordial Man

A more satisfactory solution is offered by texts which describe the life of the first men as animal-like. The epic itself gives us reason to believe that Enkidu is modeled on primordial man, for it terms Enkidu *lullû amēlu* (I,iv, 6, 13, 19). As an epithet of men this term appears elsewhere only with reference to man when he is first created.[23] This in itself is enough to establish a connection between Enkidu and primordial man. The term has often been taken to mean "savage;"[24] von Soden was more non-commital in defining it as "ursprünglicher Mensch."[25] Lambert, noting that the term is probably borrowed from Sumerian lú-u$_x$-lu, objects that the translation "savage" is based solely on the use with Enkidu and asks, on the basis of the Sumerian etymology,

> why is it not enough simply to render 'man'? The combination *lullû-amēlu* is simply the Sumerian...and its Akkadian equivalent, and it is an exact parallel of the New Testament 'Abba father.' In the same way a proper rendering of *lullû amēlu* would be 'Lullu-man'.[26]

But this argument, in relying solely on etymology and a much later *koinē* Greek parallel, ignores Akkadian idiom. For compounds in the form *x-amēlu* are widely-attested in Akkadian,[27] and are especially favored in the Gilgamesh Epic[28] (Oppenheim suggests they may express a "psychological typology" in the epic[29]), and in each case the first element functions adjectivally. So an adjectival meaning for *lullû* can hardly be denied in the compound *lullû-amēlu*. If we share Lambert's objection to "savage", we must nevertheless admit that von Soden's "ursprünglicher Mensch," with all the adjectival overtones that Mesopotamian tradition (see below) saw in that concept, is precisely the rendition the evidence calls for.[30]

A late reflex of the tradition that primordial men lived like animals is found in Berossus' quotation of Alexander Polyhistor:

> At Babylon an enormous mass of people had settled, and they lived in an unrestrained manner like animals who lack reason, and (like) wild cattle.[31]

The text then goes on to narrate how Oannes emerged from the Persian Gulf and taught men the arts and sciences of civilization.

The older form of that part of the tradition which interests us at present --- the animal-like life of the first men --- appears in a text which was long ago adduced as a parallel to the description of Enkidu.[32] The Dispute between Cattle and Grain,[33] or Lahar and Ashnan as it is sometimes called after its protagonists, begins, as such compositions frequently do,[34] with a mythological prologue whose theme is the creation of the protagonists, the goddesses of cattle and grain. The prologue sets in after An had created the Anunna-gods on "the mountain of heaven and earth."[35] Because the goddesses Ashnan (grain[36]), Uttu (clothing and weaving[37]), and Lahar (cattle/sheep[38]) did not yet exist (the text lists also "the lord ^{d}AGA.SI,"[39] "the lord ^{d}Kalkal,"[40] and "Sumuqan, the god of the plain"[41]), no sheep were born, the various types of grain did not exist, and garments did not exist.[42] Because of this:

> nam-lú-u$_x$-lu u$_4$-ri-a-ke$_4$-e-ne
> ninda kú-ù-bi nu-mu-un-zu-uš-àm
> tug-gar mu$_4$-mu$_4$-bi nu-mu-un-zu-uš-àm
> kalam giš-gi-na-a kuš-ba mu-un-gin
> udu-gin$_x$ ka-ba ú mu-ni-ib-kú
> a-šar-šar-ra-ka i-im-nag-nag-ne
>
> Mankind[a] of that time[b]
> knew not the eating of bread,
> knew not the wearing of garments;

the people went around with ... on their bodies;[c]
ate grass with their mouths like sheep,
drank water from ditches.[d]

NOTES

a. Not "Like mankind" (Kramer); see below.

b. Cf. van Dijk, *Act. Or.* 28, 16-34.

c. This line has several variants which have served as the basis of several different translations, none entirely satisfactory; see Chiera, *SRT*, p. 29:22; Jean, *RA* 26, 36:22; E. Burrows, *JRAS* 1926, 319; Langdon, *Le Poeme*, 140:22. Kramer (e.g., *The Sumerians*, 220f.) does not translate the line at all.

d. Cf. van Dijk, *Ac. Or.* 28, 42. The variant a-ḪAR-ḪAR... in *UET* 6/1, 33:25 translates in roughly the same way; cf. perhaps [ú-ru] [ḪAR] = ḫi-ir-re-[tum], *CAD Ḫ*, 199 s.v. *ḫirru* lex.; but note the cautionary comment of the *CAD* there.

To remedy the absence of (small) cattle and grain, the deities of those commodities are created in "the chamber in which the gods were created,[43] in their house du$_6$-kù" (line 26). There they provide their products for the Anunna;[44] the Anunna eat and drink these products but remain unsatisfied.[45] Therefore "for their good[46]/for the good of their sheepfolds:"

nam-lu-u$_x$-lu zi-šà[47] im-ši-ib-gál,
mankind was given zi-šà (see below).[48]

Enki and Enlil then cause Lahar and Ashnan to descend from the du$_6$-kù, which is a hill (du$_6$) above the mountain of heaven and earth.[49] They set up a sheepfold for Lahar and present her with plants and herbs in abundance (for the cattle to eat, presumably), and for Ashnan they establish a house and present her with plow and yoke. Lahar and Ashnan cause abundance to appear on earth, and

> an(var. unken)-na hé-gál mu-un-ne-gál
> kalam-ma zi-šà-gál mu-un-ne-gál
> me-dingir-re-e-ne si im-sá-sá-e-ne[50]
>
> In heaven (var.: the assembly) they brought abundance,
> In the land/on earth they brought zi-šà-gal,
> the mes of the god they direct (lines 53-55).

With all the abundance they brought, "they made good the heart of An and Enlil." The abundance produced by Lahar and Ashnan clearly refers to the abundance that they enabled mankind to produce; the concluding sentence just quoted implies that mankind succeeded in producing enough food to satisfy the gods' needs.[51] At this point the mythological prologue ends.

The creation of the Anunna is apparently represented here as taking place in the mountains east of Mesopotamia,[52] where the du$_6$-kù is located. The latter means literally "holy mound."[53] Its cosmic reference, as summarized by van Dijk primarily on the basis of the present passage, is "the holy hill...on which, in primordial times, the Anunna gods lived and on which agriculture, husbandry, weaving, everything which belongs to Sumerian culture, came into being."[54] Like other cosmic terms (e.g. *apsû*, which is in fact equated with du_6-ku in some lexical (?) texts[55]), du_6-kù is also the name of a part of some temples,[56] apparently the chamber in which "fates" are determined; the du_6-kù in the E'engurra of Eridu is taken by van Dijk to be the place where the *me*'s are determined.[57] This conception seems also associated with the fact that the month-name Tashritum (Tishre) is sometimes written $^{iti}du_6$-kù.[58] The possible association with *mes* may be significant in light of the reference to *me*'s in our text.

The most problematic passage in this text is line 35, nam-lú-u$_x$-lu zi-šà im-ši-ib-gál, "mankind was given zi-šà." The noun zi-šà when used with the verb gál is apparently an abbreviated form of the noun zi-šà-gál, perhaps abbreviated to avoid redundancy; in other words, zi-šà...gál = zi-šà-gál ...gál. The lexical equation zi-šà-gál = *šikin/šiknat napišti* was already known[59] to the first translators of this passage, who understood the noun to mean "life-breath" and accordingly rendered "mankind was created/given life/breath."[60] Kramer was apparently the first to note the conflict between this line and lines 19ff. which described "mankind when first created" several lines *before* this account of their creation;[61] to resolve this conflict he rendered line 19 as a simile: "like mankind when first created," and took the following description of primitive conditions to apply to the Anunna: it was they who in primordial times "knew not the eating of bread," etc. - like mankind later on when it was first created. Falkenstein pointed out[62] the impossibility of this solution, since the text lacked a comparative particle, and sought to solve the problem by suggesting that zi-šà...gál was here used with a nuance which did not conflict with line 19. He noted that in line 54 Lahar and Ashnan are said to have brought zi-šà-gál into the land, while in the preceding line they are said to have brought abundance (ḫé-gál) into heaven; from this he concluded that in line 35, too zi-šà...gál referred to something like prosperity, abundance:[63] mankind, which already existed, was now given abundance (by the arrival of Lahar and Ashnan in their midst).[64] Kramer remained unconvinced, and continued to render line 19 "like mankind" in subsequent publications.[65] In 1962 the CAD treated the word under the loan-word *zišagallu*, giving it the meanings "1. divine encouragement, fortitude of heart, 2. (greeting formula used in addressing a king)."[66] Our line 35 was included under the first meaning and rendered "they (the Anunnaki) caused encouragement to be among men." In the discussion following it was stated: "In the Sum. passages, the word denotes the encouragement conveyed by word of mouth, a specific act or by mere presence, from one god to another, or by a god or king to a human being or person of lesser status...The Akk. rendering by *Šiknat* (or *šikin*) *napišti* is due to a confusion with nig.zi.gál which seems to mean something like *élan vital* (German *Lebensodem*)." Falkenstein returned to the subject again in 1965 in his study of the Anunna,[67] and suggested that since man already existed at this point, in our passage the phrase means "that the Anunna made them capable of rational behavior"[68] (perhaps considering that zi-šà = life in the heart ([=mind]). A few years later he studied the word zi-šà-gál at length[69] and discerned four different meanings: 1. the life-breath present in the body; 2. a being which has life-breath in it; 3. someone who gives life-breath; 4. something which gives life-breath. Our passage was treated under the compound verb zi-šà...gál, and translated "they caused mankind to have life-breath within the body."[70] Finally, the word was treated by Hallo and van Dijk in *The Exaltation of Inanna* in 1968.[71] They explicitly rejected the *CAD*'s "encouragement" and translated "sustenance"[72] in the sense of "food;" they rendered our passage "they gave sustenance to mankind." This interpretation may well receive support from the variant reading in *UET* VI/1, 33:33, which replaces zi-šà in our passage with KA x ?-bi; unfortunately the first sign is difficult to identify.

Any of these alternatives to "was given life" would resolve the conflict with line 19: abundance, encouragement (whatever that means), rationality, or sustenance. Which, if any of these, was appropriate to our passage would have remained a matter of guesswork, however, were it not for new textual evidence which clarifies the meaning considerably.

The evidence is in a Sumerian composition entitled "The Rulers of Lahash" by its editor, E. Sollberger.[73] Sollberger derives the text from Lagash of the Middle Old Babylonian period and takes it as

> a politico-satirical work written by a Lagash scribe in answer to the author(s) of the Sumerian King List who had ignored the rulers of Lagaš...[He] may have wanted to show... that...Lagaš could trace the line of her rulers as far back as the Flood...[74]

The list of rulers is preceded by a long mythological introduction describing the restoration of civilization after the flood. This account is of interest to us because the restoration of civilization duplicates in many respects its original introduction in antediluvian times.[75] Among works "dealing with the origin and development of civilization" Sollberger supposed our author was familiar with Enki and the World Order and Lugal-e.[76] Of special interest to us, however, is the similarity with Lahar and Ashnan. Ashnan's inactivity and subsequent return to activity comprises an important topic in the account; and the word zi-šà-gál occurs in an illuminating context. The section describing the reestablishment of agriculture includes the following sentence:[77]

50. i$_7$ dun-n[e-dè]   In order to dig canals,

51. e-pa$_5$-re š[u!-luḫ nà-dè]   to dredge dyke-ditches,

52. a-gàr gal-gal-e $^{\text{g[iš}}$sún-na nag-e-dè]	to let the noria water the great irrigation plots,
53. gán-né gána zi-d[è a hé-gál-la / im[ta-an-dé-dè]	to let the water of plenty water the field, the arable field:
54. $^{\text{giš}}$al $^{\text{giš}}$mar $^{\text{g[i}}$dusu $^{\text{giš}}$apin-e]	the spade, the hoe, the basket, (and) the plow,
55. zi-šà-gál k[alam-ma]	(which are) the life-breath of the land,
56. ukù-šè im-ta-an-[gar-re-eš]	they established for the people.

Earlier in the text, prior to the reestablishment of agriculture, the reverse of the above is stated:

11. $^{\text{d}}$[ni]n-[g]ír-su $^{\text{giš}}$al $^{\text{giš}}$[mar]	Ningirsu,[78] the spade, the hoe,
12. $^{\text{gi}}$dusu $^{\text{gis}}$apin-e zi-šà-gál kal[am-ma]	the basket, (and) the plow, (which are) the life-breath of the land,
13. ukù sì-ga šár-a nu-gar-re-eš-a-ba	they had not (yet) established (for) the countless overwhelmed people.

In these sentences zi-šà-gál kalam-ma is juxtaposed to "the spade, the hoe, and basket, (and) the plow" - the tools with which man produces his food. Calling these tools "the life of the land" must refer to their being the indispensable basis of man's sustenance. This fits into Falkenstein's fourth definition of zi-šà-gál: something which gives life. Another example of this usage is the description of water as a zi-šà-gál-kur-kur-ra, "water, the life-breath of all the lands."[79] This usage resembles, as Falkenstein notes, that of zi-gál in describing a river as i$_7$-zi-gál-kala[m-ma], "the river, the life-breath of the land."[80] The synonymy of zi-šà-gál and zi-gál in these phrases suggests that zi-šà is not basically different from zi in this usage. Ashnan, the goddess of grain is called zi-sag-gíg-ga, "life of the blackheads."[81] Akk. *napištu* (followed by *nīši* or *māti*) is frequently used in the same way, often with the same commodities or things. Thus water is referred to as *mē napšat nīši*, "water, the life of the peoples,"[82] as are the Tigris and Euphrates.[83] Most such usages refer to sustenance which is characteristic of civilized beings (or their domesticated animals) alone. Thus beer,[84] wine,[85] and grain[86] are referred to as *napšat*[81]/*napišti nīši*. Closer to the usage in The Rulers of Lagash is the description of fields with the same term[88] (cf. also the description of a watercourse as *mukinnat napišti māti*[89]).

The association of this phrase with civilized life calls to mind other phrases used in similar contexts. Thus while strong drink is referred to as *napišti nīši*, as above, in GEP iii, 14 drinking it is called *šīmti māti*, "the custom of the land;"[90] parallel to it is a description of eating human food as *simat balāṭim*, "the sign of (civilized) life."[91] Thus the commodities and implements themselves are called *napištu*, "life, sustenance," and the activities are called *šimtu* "custom; lot", or *simtu*, "mark".

We conclude that zi-šà-gál in both The Rulers of Lagash and Lahar and Ashnan refers to the bases of civilized life. While we need not restrict the meaning in the latter text to precisely those implements enumerated in the former, the clear relatedness of the two texts suggests that the meaning is close. In view of the description of precivilized conditions in Lahar and Ashnan in terms of food, drink, and nakedness, it is likely that zi-šà-gál there refers at least in part to distinctively human food and drink (and to clothing) - in other words, to those very things which are personified by the deities whose absence was noted in the precivilization section of the text. On the other hand, since zi-šà-gál was given to man for the gods' benefit, the term must also include the agricultural implements with which man was enabled to produce abundance for the gods (the statement that Lahar and Ashnan "administered the *me*'s of the gods" could refer to this).[92] The text thus relates how man first acquired human food and drink (and possibly other staples) and the implements used in producing them, all of which constitute the distinctive features of human civilization.[93] It is not easy to translate a term which refers at one and the same time to implements and processes and that which they produce. Perhaps we must resort to something as neutral and colorless as "that which sustains life."

This description corresponds with Polyhistor's description of how mankind was instructed by Oannes (=Adapa, the first *apkallu*[94]) in everything which would tend to domesticate human life.[95] This correspondence of Lahar and Ashnan with the *apkallu* tradition may also extend to the statement that Lahar and Ashnan "administered the *me*'s of the gods" (line 55),[96] since the seven *apkallu*'s who were created in the "river" (this could refer to the Persian Gulf,[97] from which Oannes-Adapa is said by Berossus to have emerged[98]) are also said to "administer the 'patterns' (*uṣurātu*) of heaven and earth."[99] The latter passage occurs in connection with Adapa[100] and recalls the statement in the Adapa myth that Adapa had been given wisdom *uṣurāt mati kul!-lu-mu*, "to teach (mankind) the 'patterns' of the land" (Adapa fragment A,3).[101] Lambert has recently argued[102] that *uṣurtu* and *šimtu* both refer to the various norms and conventions of human society or the established order of the universe, and Jacobsen earlier[103] defined me (Akk. *parṣu*) similarly as "set, normative pattern (of behavior)," "norm",. while Kramer[104] described them more generally as "culture traits and complexes."[105] The *apkallu*'s have been described as "mediators between the divine MEs and human knowledge."[106] In Lahar and Ashnan it is those two deities who play that role, as do other gods of various commodities and skills in other Sumerian texts.[107] In other words, the *apkallu*'s represent one tradition of how the *me*'s were transmitted to mankind, while in other traditions individual gods of skills and commodities, who are not called *apkallu's*, play that role.[108]

In these traditions we have a picture of what is distinctive of humanity as against sub-human life. Berossus says as much by describing Adapa's teachings as including that which would "tame" or "civilize" (Gk. ἡμέρωσιν) men's lives. We have here a conception which is comparable, but not identical, to the concept of humanity (nam-lú-u$_x$-lu) in Sumerian wisdom literature. The latter has been described by van Dijk as equivalent to the Latin *humanitas* in the sense of "the complete blossoming forth of human values, humanism."[109] That concept is at home in the Sumerian scribal academies. It refers to intellectual achievements[110] and, with its Akkadian equivalent *awīlūtum*[111] as used mainly in Old Babylonian and Old Assyrian letters, to gentlemanly ethical standards.[112] The conception we are dealing with is a more basic one, involving those features of civilization which distinguish human life from animal.

Returning now to our point of departure, the description of Enkidu, the description of primordial mankind in Lahar and Ashnan presents a likely antecedent. Enkidu's "not knowing" the eating of (human) food (GEP iii, 6, 9) is paralleled in primordial man's not knowing bread for eating (Lahar and Ashnan line 20); Enkidu's nakedness (implied in GEP ii, 27-30; iii, 26) is paralleled in primordial man's apparent nakedness

(Lahar and Ashnan lines 21, 22? Note also the absence of Uttu, lines 4, 16). Enkidu's eating grass (GE I,ii,39) is paralleled in primordial man's eating grass with his mouth like sheep (Lahar and Ashnan line 23), and his jostling at the watering place, his heart delighting in water (GE I,ii,40f.) is paralleled in primordial man's drinking water from ditches (Lahar and Ashnan line 24).

The change in Enkidu is summed up in the OB version by the statement *awēlīs iwē*, "he became human" (GEP iii, 25). In the Neo-Assyrian version Enkidu is said, after his experience with the prostitute, to have acquired "[wi]sdom, [br]oader understanding" to have become "[wi]se" (GE I, iv, 29, 34). We have noted above that these passages are not each other's early and late counterparts, since the fragment published by Heidel[113] shows that the late version also contained the scene in which in which Enkidu meets the shepherds, including their giving him food and drink (lines 8-11). Consequently we must understand the scene described in GE I,iv to have preceded in the epic's sequence that described in GEP ii-iii. What GE I,iv described, then, is how Enkidu first acquired the intellectual *potential* to adopt human ways and implements, while GEP ii-iii describe how he then adopted those ways and implements themselves. It is the latter scene which corresponds thematically to the passages in Lahar and Ashnan which describe how man was given zi-šà(-gál), i.e., the commodities and implements of civilized life. What GE I owes to the Lahar and Ashnan traditions, then, is its description of pre-civilized conditions in col. ii, not that of how civilization was achieved in col iv. The source for the latter is beyond the scope of the present inquiry.

There is no way of telling whether the picture of Enkidu was drawn directly from Lahar and Ashnan. Even in the case of the creation of Enkidu (above, Ch. V) where we found verbal similarities between GE and an "antecedent" in Atrahasis, we were unable to conclude confidently that the latter was the source from which GE drew, although certain circumstantial evidence seemed to make that plausible. Here, however, we do not even have such verbal similarities. We can claim no more than that Lahar and Ashnan (and, more distantly, Alexander Polyhistor's account of primordial man) represents a circle of traditions about the life-style of primordial man before the development of civilization, and that it is this circle of traditions from which - as suggested by several scholars - GE drew its picture of Enkidu. This conclusion accords with that of the preceding section, that the account of the creation of Enkidu was modeled on the account of the creation of mankind, especially as described in Atrahasis.

There is a possible discrepancy between Atrahasis and Lahar and Ashnan which must be mentioned here. According to Atrahasis, the god from whose body man is created is a god *ša išû ṭēma*, "who had *ṭēmu*" (I, 223, cf. 239, 243 [text P]; II, vii, 33). Some have taken *ṭemu* here to refer to intelligence.[114] Furthermore there is to be a "spirit (*eṭemmu*) from the god's flesh" (I, 215) *aššu lā muššî*, which means either "so that (this) not be forgotten"[115] or "so that there be no forgetfulness, negligence;" the latter translation would be based on En. El. VI, 109 and 118, where, when man is created, he is to "acclaim Marduk's ways to the end of days, without forgetting (*lā mašê*)" and to "support their gods without forgetting (*aia immaša*)."[116] In any case both of the Atrahasis passages might imply that man was given intelligence, or at least memory, at creation, while Lahar and Ashnan describes a "brutish" kind of life which might be said to imply a lack of intelligence; in fact, the Gilgamesh Epic, by describing Enkidu's transformation as *iši ṭē[ma u]rappaš ḫasisa*...[*en*(?)]*qata*, "he now had wisd[om, br]oader understanding... you are [wi]se" (I,iv, 29, 34),[117] shows itself to have had precisely such an evaluation of Enkidu's early life and, by implication, the life of primordial man such as pictured in Lahar and Ashnan. So does a later Biblical parallel in Dan. 4 where a situation identical to Enkidu's, and in my opinion likely dependent on the Gilgamesh Epic's picture of Enkidu, is attributed to the absence of a "human 'heart'" (=mind; Dan. 4:13; 5:21) or "knowledge" (4:31) and its replacement by the "'heart' of a beast" (4:13).

Now a contradiction such as this between original sources

XUM

would not be surprising. It is the stuff of which source criticism is made. Nevertheless, this is not necessarily the case here. It has been argued convincingly by Lambert-Millard[118] and Moran[119] that _ṭēmu_ in Atrahasis does not mean "intelligence." And while the function of the _eṭemmu_ is to provide memory, either in general or of a particular event, memory is not the same thing as rationality and culture. Atrahasis is in fact noncommittal about primordial man's mentality. It certainly does not imply that man at first lacked intelligence. In this respect the Gilgamesh Epic adds something to the picture of primordial man which was absent from Atrahasis but is not necessarily contradictory to it. The author may well have shared the view that primordial man lived like animals; his silence on the subject would be due to its irrelevance to his theme.

One final question must be mentioned in connection with the literary pre-history of the creation and early life of Enkidu: did the combination of traditions which we have described first take place in the Gilgamesh Epic, or was it prior to their incorporation in the epic? The implication of Jastrow's studies is that there may once have been an independent Enkidu epic which was perhaps an epic of the first man, which was secondarily combined with traditions about Gilgamesh to form the Gilgamesh Epic. This possibility arises from a sort of triangulation from the story of Enkidu and the Biblical Eden narrative. The same question might indeed be asked about the Eden narrative. It clearly combines numerous motifs which are attested independently in Mesopotamian sources,[120] and one would dearly like to know whether the combination took place in Israel, Mesopotamia, or elsewhere. The question of the story of Enkidu cannot be pursued here, for this dissertation is on principle restricted to conclusions which can be reached or at least sought on the basis of available documents without extrapolation. Here we can only note that an inquiry into the Enkidu and Eden parallel will have to account also for two Indian stories, cited by Albright,[121] which resemble the story of Enkidu.

D. Enkidu's Early Life and the Values of the Epic

It has been felt by a number of scholars that the narrative of Enkidu's early life is a secondary addition to the epic which was absent in the earliest forms of the epic and its individual episodes.[122] This is plausible on several grounds. Least conclusive is the fact that we have no Sumerian version of this pericope. In the Sumerian episodes Enkidu is Gilgamesh's servant, not his friend or equal, and as such his beginnings would not have to be accounted for.[123] The entire series of events leading up to the meeting of Gilgamesh and Enkidu serves to account for their friendship, a motif present only in the Akkadian version; as Kramer argued, this series of events was therefore uncalled for in the Sumerian versions.[124] In fact, in the Sumerian version of the *pukku* incident - which in the Akkadian version is part of the situation which necessitates the creation of Enkidu - Enkidu is already alive, married, and the father of children.[125] Shaffer has called attention to a passage which may even imply that in the Sumerian versions Enkidu was much older than Gilgamesh and had raised him from childhood.[126] For all these reasons it appears likely that the creation and early life of Enkidu are indeed a secondary feature of the epic.

Why was this extraneous element added? What is its purpose within the larger composition? This is one of the most important questions about the epic.[127] In keeping with his view that Enkidu represents the Amorite nomad Dossin held that the friendship of Enkidu and Gilgamesh aimed at expressing and supporting literarily the union of nomadic and sedentary, urban peoples achieved under the reign of Hammurapi.[128] In denying that Enkidu was modeled on the nomad, but rather on primordial man whose culture was that of the animal, we perceive the contrast as one between human civilization and its absence. Enkidu is first civilized by the prostitute (*ḫarimtu*) Šamḫat,[129] who is, it is true, representative of Uruk, which is called elsewhere *āl kezrēti, šamḫātu u ḫarimāti*, "city of courtesans, hierodules, and prostitutes" (Erra IV, 52; cf. GE VI, 166);[130] and he is subsequently brought to the city. But his civilizing experience takes place before he arrives there. It is summed up in the phrase *awēliš iwē*, "he became human" (GEP iii, 25), not "a city dweller" (*āšib āli*, *ālu*). Uruk appears in the epic as the locus of human culture - perhaps even the very best of human culture;[131] but what is stressed throughout the epic is the humanity rather than urbanity of that culture. Even if the culture of Uruk is viewed as higher than that of the shepherds among whom Enkidu was first humanized - the latter representing, as it were, only the first step in the process[132]--this gradation is of no significance in the epic.[133]

Thus contrast between human and animal culture was perceived by Kirk, who saw it as one of the main themes of the epic:

> One of the main preoccupations of the Central Brazilian Indians was seen to be the relationship between nature and culture, the untamed and the tamed, the raw and the cooked, and the tensions, contradictions, and paradoxes that operated between these extremes. I believe the Gilgamesh epic in its developed Akkadian form to be partly concerned with exploring, consciously or not, something of the same polarity. Men have always been preoccupied with status: with their relations as individuals to families, as families to clans, as clans to tribes - more generally still with their own society's relation to the world outside. That world extends from its broadest cosmological aspects (sky and heavenly bodies, for many the abode of gods or spirits) to the immediate terrestrial environment. It is here that the nature-culture contrast is seen at its most striking, in differences between the organization of the village and its surrounding fields, or the whole cultivated area and the enfolding forest or desert; between the customs and rules of men and women and those applied between animals; between human cultural techniques and the natural processes they seem to imitate, as Aristotle put it, or to counteract.[134]

The significance within the epic of Enkidu's rise to civilization is made clear in Shamash's answer to the dying

Enkidu who has cursed Šamḫat for bringing him to civilization and thereby ultimately causing his death. Upon hearing Enkidu's curse Shamash rejoins:

Why, O Enkidu, cursest thou the harlot Šamhat,
Who made thee eat food fit for divinity,
Who gave thee to drink wine fit for royalty,
Who clothed thee with noble garments,
And made thee have fair Gilgamesh for a comrade?
And has (not) now Gilgamesh, thy bosom friend,
Made thee lie on a noble couch?
He has made thee lie on a couch of honor,
He has placed thee on the seat of ease, the seat at the left,
That [the prin]ces of the earth may kiss thy feet!
He will make Uruk's people weep over thee (and) lament,
Will fill [joyful] people with woe over thee.
And, when thou art gone, he will his body with uncut hair invest,
Will don a lion skin and roam over the steppe.[135]

These are the boons of civilized life as Enkidu experienced them in Uruk,

Where people are re[splend]ent in festal attire,
(Where) each day is made a holiday,
...[136]

By not denying Enkidu's charge that Šamḫat "brought [death?] upon me,"[137] Shamash implies that the life to which Šamḫat brought Enkidu was worth living in spite of the untimely death it

XUM

entailed. His answer is in spirit and in some detail comparable with the barmaid's[138] advice to Gilgamesh in GEM iii, 6-14:

Thou, Gilgamesh, let full be thy belly,
Make thou merry by day and by night.
Of each day make thou a feast of rejoicing,
Day and night dance thou and play!
Let thy garments be sparkling fresh,
Thy head be washed; bathe thou in water.
Pay heed to the little one that holds on to thy hand,
Let thy spouse delight in thy bosom!
For this is the task of [mankind]!"[139]

These are the benefits which mortals can hope to derive from life. Their character as marks of human life is also made clear in GE XII and its Sumerian source Gilgamesh, Enkidu, and the Netherworld, where Enkidu, when he went to the Netherworld,

Put on clean raiment:
They marked him as an alien;
With sweet oil from the cruse he anointed himself
...[140]

A few lines later there is a passage mentioning acts of affection, as well as hostility, towards members of Enkidu's family, which recall more indirectly the end of the barmaid's remarks:

He kissed his beloved wife,
He struck his hated wife;
He kissed his beloved son,

He struck his hated son.[141]

In the context of GE XII these are signs of the living in contrast with the dead: they are the satisfactions of human life which will provoke the jealous anger of the dead who no longer enjoy them.

These passages amply confirm the view that the epic explores the meaning of life as well as death.[142] And this, I submit, is the reason for the epic's describing Enkidu's early life as an uncivilized animal: by contrasting a life devoid of humanity, the epic underlines the satisfactions that human life offers - in other words, that minimum amount of "meaning" which *is* available in life; this is the epic's message. This is shown most explicitly in the case of Enkidu, whose rise to civilization is described not only as "becoming human" but also as becoming - in the only way possible for humans,[143] through intelligence and civilization - "godlike" (*kima ili tabašši*, I, iv, 34; cf. VII, iii, 36).

The values expressed in these passages have often been described as "hedonistic."[144] Their philosophy is not unique in the ancient Near East.[145] But it is worth noting an alternative set of values attested in the Gilgamesh tradition which seems designedly underplayed in the epic. In the Sumerian Death of Gilgamesh we also find a statement of what the gods have granted Gilgamesh in lieu of immortality:

Enlil...

Has destined thy fate, O Gilgamesh, for kingship,
    for eternal life he has not destined it.
...
Supremacy over mankind he has granted thee,
Unmatched...he has granted thee,
Battle *from which none may retreat* he has granted thee,
Onslaughts unrivalled he has granted thee,
Attacks from which none may escape, he has granted thee.[146]

These are endowments most appropriate to a king; indeed, many of these phrases can be paralleled in royal inscriptions.[147] The sense of values expressed in this passage is that summed up in Erra I, 51:

alāk ṣēri ša eṭlūti kī ša isinnumma,
Taking to the field of manhood is like a holiday.[148]

The same sense of values, subsumed under the term *awēlu*, is expressed also in Shamshi-Adad's famous letter to his son Yasmaḫ-Addu criticizing him for sleeping with women and urging him, when he goes with his troops to Qatanum, *lū awīlat*, "be a man!" by winning a military victory.[149] Yasmaḫ-Addu's pursuit of a hedonistic rather than militaristic life has a mythological parallel in the Erra Epic where Ishum and the Divine Seven seek to rouse Erra to battle while he prefers to sleep and make love with his spouse Mami.[150] Erra is in fact following the advice expressed by Naram-Sin; the latter, it will be recalled,[151] advised his audience, *inter alia*, to "enjoy yourself in your wife's embrace" (*ina sūn sinništika šipir lū teppuš*),[152] and to "bind up your weapons and put (them/yourself[153]) into a corner" ($^{\text{GIŠ}}$*kakkēka rukkusma tubqāti ēmid*),[154] just as Erra orders his weapons into a corner (*ummeda tubqāti*)[155] and "makes love with his spouse Mami" (*itti* ^{d}*Mami hīrātuš ippuša ulṣamma*).[156]

At the beginning of the Gilgamesh Epic we found Gilgamesh pursuing hedonistic pleasures to excess. He also found satisfaction in personal feats of valor, defeating his fellows in contests of various types. He may have conquered Uruk in the first place. In his pursuit of immortality he conquered Huwawa and the Bull of Heaven. In the end these conquests brought him no satisfaction and were, as Shaffer observed,[157] of no account to the author of the epic. To the author Gilgamesh's only enduring achievements are the wall of Uruk and especially the wisdom he acquired on his journies and left inscribed on a stele for posterity. This stele must have included the "hedonistic" advice he received from Siduri, just as Naram-Sin's stele contained a similar bit of "hedonistic" advice.

The preference for hedonistic over militaristic values in the epic may also explain its enduring attraction for modern readers: while military feats are for the few, the simple pleasures advocated by Siduri are - as indicated by their occurence outside of Mesopotamia in non-royal literary contexts[158] - something the common man can strive for. And if one should have to choose between these two philosophies, I suspect that in today's world hedonism might be less unwelcome than militarism.

NOTES FOR CHAPTER 6

1. Most of these are collected, summarized, and analyzed in Buccellati, *The Amorites of the Ur III Period*, pp. 92ff., 330ff.; cf. J.R. Kupper, *Les Nomades*, 157; Falkenstein, *CRRAI* 2, 16-17; D.O. Edzard, *ZZB*, 31ff.
2. *SEM* 58; transliteration and translation by Chiera *SRT*, pp. 14-23. The section quoted here is treated by Buccellati, 92f., on which the translation below is based; for some variations in detail see Kramer, *Genava* NS 8, 281 with n. 34; Roux, *Ancient Iraq*, 161.
3. Buccellati, 331.
4. Buccellati, 330 (add: Enki and the World Order, lines 129f., 246f., and the Nachtrag of Bernhardt and Kramer, *WZJ* 9, 256).
5. Buccellati, 331; cf. also the proverb referred to *ibid.*, n. 46.
6. *Ibid.* 94.
7. *SBH*, p. 107 rev. 3f., quoted from *CADA*$_2$, 94a lex.
8. Cf. Henri Frankfort, *Cylinder Seals*, pp. 62-66.
9. The term is used by Reiner in *Languages and Areas*..., 118.
10. W. Heimpel, *Tierbilder*, p. 224 (#10.14), quoting *ZANF* 15, 106:24; see the commentary *a.l.*, p. 128.
11. Ibid., #10.13. cf. Gordon, *SP* 1.30: It is (only) a wild ox in the netherworld which does not eat grass; it is (only) a gazelle in the netherworld which does not drink water;" cf. Gordon, *JAOS* 74, 83 n. 17; Lambert, *BWL* 238 bottom.

12. Bezold, *Catalog* II, 841; cf. Winckler, *OLZ* I, 71; Böhl, *RLA* II, 119, s.v. "Daniel."

13. A. L. Oppenheim, letter of Jan. 22, 1968.

14. Oppenheim, who was kind enought to respond to my inquiry concerning this passage (see previous note) reads the noun as *piširtu*, whose "meaning varies from 'secret,' to 'release, relief,' or the like;" he adds, however that the meaning in the present context cannot be established because the dingir.dib-ba ritual genre to which the passage belongs is not well understood.

15. Cf. *BWL*, 44f.:106f.; 294 *sub* 106-7; *ANET*, 590:97, 99; Ps. 73:22; F. Ali, *Sumerian Letters*, (1964, Univ. microfilms), letters B 7 and 8 *passim*.

16. Ali, *ibid*, B 7:7.

17. Wiseman, *VTE*, 60:421.

18. J. Rendel Harris, *The Story of Ahikar*^{2}, lxi, 116 n. 4.

19. Cf. Sjöberg, *JCS* 21, 78; Hallo, *17^{e} RAI*, 132 *sub* Line 44.

20. Hallo, *JAOS* 88, 83:25, corrected following a private suggestion of C. Wilcke.

21. LH xxvi, 98-xxvii, 6

22. Culley, *Oral Formulaic Language and the Psalms*, Lord, *The Singer of Tales*; Finkelstein, *JCS* 11, 88.

23. Atrahasis I, 195; G, ii, 9; V, obv. 2, 4; En. El. VI, 6f. Von Soden finds an additional reference in GE X, vi, 35, where in place of Thompson's *amēlu-u* ^{am}*e-ṭil*, translated

by Speiser as "the commoner and the noble," he reads (*ZA* 53, 231) *lullû^{u} amēlu e-ṭel*, "der Wildlings-Mensch ist ein Mann," taking the term to refer "figuratively" (*AHw*, 562c) to Utnapishtim; this requires further study (cf. the interpretation of Oppenheim, *Or.* 17, 50 n. 4). Other passages listed in *AHw*, 562c for this word are dismissed by Lambert (*JSS* 12, 105) as belonging to a different word or as obscure.

24. Cf. Speiser, *ANET* 68 n. 86.

25. *AHw*, 562c; but note "Wildlings-Mensch" in *ZA* 53, quoted above, n. 23.

26. *JSS* 12, 105.

27. Oppenheim, *Or.* 17, 25 n. 4; 19, 129 n. 1; Speiser, *ANET* 72ff., nn. 19, 23, 126, 170; *CAD* A$_2$, 52d; Nougayrol *Ugaritica* 5, 233; cf. 305 n. 1; Hallo, *Eretz-Israel* IX, 66 adds some early Sumerian prototypes.

28. Cf. Speiser and Hallo, *locc. citt.*

29. *Or.* 17, 25 n. 4.

30. Cf. Finkelstein in J. Neusner (ed.), *Religions in Antiquity*, 95, 99: "proto-man."

31. Translated from Jacoby, *Die Fragmente*...III C, 369f.

32. Driver, *Genesis* (1904), p. 41 n. 2.

33. For a bibliography of texts see Gordon, *Bi.Or.* 17, 145 n. 210, with additions in Borger, *HKL* I, 14 *sub* Barton, *MBI* §8. M. Civil is preparing a complete edition (according

to Kramer, *JCS* 18, 48 n. 108). For secondary literature see *HKL*, *loc. cit.*, adding: Falkenstein, *Bi.Or.* 5, 165; *AS* 16, 132 with nn. 65-67; Edzard, in Haussig (ed.), *WbMyth* 94.

34. Castellino, *VT Supp.* IV, 116-137. *BWL* 150; Kramer, *The Sumerians*, 218.

35. Cf. Jacobsen, *JNES* 5, 141.

36. Edzard in *WbMyth*, 68 s.v. "Getreidegottheiten": Ashnan = emmer.

37. *Ibid.*, 57 s.v. "Enki und Ninhursanga": Uttu = goodess of weaving and washing; Jacobsen, *JNES* 5, 143: goddess of weaving and/or washing clothes.

38. Edzard in *WbMyth*, 94 s.v. "Lahar und Ashnan": Lahar may = mother sheep.

39. EN.DINĜIR.AGA.SI is identified by some with ^{d}En-mer-si, an epithet of Tammuz (Burrows, *JRAS* 1926, 319; Langdon, *Le Poeme*, 140 n. 1, with reference to *BL* 96 n. 1 and Tammuz and Ishtar, 29).

40. For Kalkal, the doorkeeper of the Ekur cf. Lambert, *Atrahasis*, note on I, 74.

41. Edzard in *WbMyth*, 118.

42. Kramer omits this line (15) in his translations of this text (e.g. *The Sumerians*, 220).

43. See Falkenstein, *AS* 16, 132, for this translation. For a borrowing from this text see CT 16, 14:iv, 29, quoted in *CADB*, 317d lex.; discussed by Landsberger, *WdO* III, 77.

44. Edzard, *WbMyth*, 94. Cf. the purpose of these gods' creation in when Anu had created the heavens, lines 33f. (Heidel, *BG*^{2} 66:33f.): "to provide abundant regular offerings."

45. Falkenstein, *Bi.Or.* 5, 165 with n. 15, *contra* Jacobsen, *JNES* 5, 142f.

46. Cf. Falkenstein, *AS* 16, 132, *contra* Kramer, *The Sumerians*. But see now also Falkenstein, *ZA* 58, 11.

47. Var. KA x ?-bi (*UET* VI/1, 33:33).

48. Text according to Falkenstein, *ZA* 58, 11. The line is misquoted in *CADZ*, 138c (below, n. 66).

49. Van Dijk, *SGL* II, 134.

50. Text according to Falkenstein, *ZA* 58, 11f.

51. Edzard, *WbMyth*, 94. For "make the heart good" = satisfy (in legal contexts) see Y. Muffs, *Studies in the Aramaic Legal Papyri from Elephantine* (*SD* VIII).

52. Jacobsen, *JNES* 5, 141 and predecessors listed by him. Jacobsen rejects Kramer's "world mountain;" van Dijk, *SGL* II, 133f. seems to agree with Kramer.

53. Jacobsen, *loc. cit.*

54. Van Dijk, *SGL* II, 133f.

55. *SL* 459:42a.

56. *SGL* II, 134; Sjöberg, *TCS* III, 50 *sub* 4.

57. *SGL* II, 134; Edzard, *WbMyth*, 51; Sjöberg, *loc. cit.*

58. *SL* 459:43; van Dijk, *SGL* II, 134 for bibliography.

59. Cf. earlier references collected in *SL* 384:56a-b and Poebel,

XUM

AS 14, 71 n.a.

60. Chiera, *SRT* p. 29: "were brought into existence;" Jean, *RA* 26 (1929), 37: "en vie fut mise;" Kramer, *SM*, 145: "was given breath."

61. His reasoning was understood by Falkenstein, *Bi.Or.* 5, 165 n. 14.

62. *Ibid.*

63. In *UET* VI/1, 30: rev. 7 zi-šà-gál occurs parallel to ḫé-gál, but on the basis of parallel texts (cf. *AfO* 16, 60:17; 63) Falkenstein suspects zi-šà-gál to be an erronious "Lautvariant" for zi-sù-ud-gál, "long life" (*ZA* 58, 12).

64. *Bi.Or.* 5, 165 n. 14.

65. *FTS* 145 = *HBS* 111; *The Sumerians*, 220f.

66. *CADZ*, 138. *CAD* reads in our passage zi-šà-gál, rather than zi-šà, referring to "SRT 25 i 20 and dupl.," but Falkenstein, *ZA* 58, 11, lists no such variant.

67. *AS* 16, 127-140. In 1949 he had referred to the word's occurrence in Gudea inscriptions, translating "Leben," (*Grammatik*, p. 64).

68. *AS* 16, 132.

69. *ZA* 58, 10-15.

70. *Ibid.*, 11.

71. *YNER* 3, Glossary, p. 95, s.v. zi-šà-gala$_7$; cf. also the preceding entry.

72. This meaning was not accepted by Kramer in translating the same Inanna-hymn in *ANET*^{3}, 581:92 ("living creatures").

XUM

73. *JCS* 21, 279-291.

74. *Ibid.* 279f.

75. Cf. the similar duplication between Gen. 1 and 9. In Atrahasis the aftermath of the flood does not seem to involve a reinauguration of civilization duplicating the old (partially preserved in I, 319-351), but it does involve a change in the order of things (III, vi, end, and vii) comparable to Gen. 9:2f. (contrast 1:29).

76. *Op. cit.*, 279.

77. The translation is Sollberger's.

78. As Sollberger notes, there is a grammatical problem in assuming that Nirgirsu created these implements (*op.cit.*, 283 n. 25). But it is worth noting that Nirgirsu is said to create zi-šà-gál in another text as well (Gud. Cyl. A, XI, 24, quoted by Falkenstein, *ZA* 58, 11).

79. *SLTNi* 16:rev. 8' (Falkenstein, *ZA* 58, 14).

80. *UET* VI/1, 106:33 (Falkenstein, *ZA* 58, 13 n. 22, cf. 14 n. 27a).

81. Enki and the World Order, 330.

82. *BWL* 196f.; *AfO* 18, 386:19. See refs. in *AHw*, 738d.

83. Lambert, *Atrahasis* 42:22, 24; 43: Ass. rec. 6; Reiner, *JNES* 15, 134:49.

84. Ludlul II, 89.

85. Theodicy 32.

86. LH xxvii rev. 11-12.

87. On the reading *napšat* vs. *nablaṭ* (*AHw* 698a), which would mean the same thing, see *BWL*, 293 *sub* 89; Biggs, *ANET*^{3},

598 n. 7a; 602 n. 1a.

88. *Sumer* 3, 11:10; *YOS* 2, 48:14. It is not clear whether *napiš[ti] māti* in *BWL*, 126:18 refers to the corn or its field.

89. *ITn* 16:103 (ref. *AHw* 738d).

90. See Finkelstein, *JAOS* 90, 251 where one of the customs so described is marriage; for *šīmtu* as a custom of civilization (including this passage), see also Lambert, *Or.* 39, 175.

91. Translation following *CADB*, 47d; for *balāṭu* as civilized life cf. GE I, v, 13. On bread as a mark of civilization see Shaffer, 27 n. 3.

92. See n. 96.

93. Cf. Ben Sira's summary statements: "The chief thing for the life (var. adds: of man) is water and bread, and a garment, and a house to cover nakedness" (Ben Sira 29:21); "The chief of all the necessities of life for man are water and fire, and iron and salt, the fat of wheat, milk and honey, the blood of the grape (=wine), oil and clothing" (39:26).

94. Lambert, *JCS* 16, 74; van Dijk, *UVB* 18, 47f.; Hallo, *JAOS* 83, 176 n. 79.

95. Jacoby, *Die Fragmente*...III C, 369f.

96. For several examples of administering (*šutēšuru*) *parṣu* and *uṣurātu* in a ritual sense see *CADE*, 363ab.

97. An arm of the Persian Gulf is known as ^{id}Marratu (see Streck, *Asb.* II, 336f., n. 15).

98. Jacoby, *op. cit.*, 369.

99. Reiner, *Or.* 30, 2:7'-9'.

100. See Reiner, *ibid.*, 7.

101. Jensen *KB* 6/1, 92f.:3; Speiser, *ANET*, 101.

102. *Or.* 39, 174f., with reference to Atrahasis S, iii, 14 (which presumably refers to lines 15ff.) and R, rev. 5.

103. *JNES* 5, 139 n. 20.

104. *The Sumerians*, 113.

105. For a discussion of me when applied to gods see Hallo-van Dijk, *YNER* 3, 49f.

106. Van Dijk *SSA*, 20; cf. Lambert-Millard, *Atrahasis*, 13f.

107. Cf. The Creation of the Pickaxe (Kramer, *SM* 51-53), How Grain Came to Sumer (*TMHNF* 3, No. 5), Enki and the World Order (WZJ 9, 231-255), and similar texts.

108. Compare Sanchunyaton's account of the origins of civilization (in I.P. Cory, *Ancient Fragments*, 5-16) and see the remarks of Gadd, *Ideas of Divine Rule*, 11, and Castellino, *SVT* IV, 135 *sub* 14, who both come close to making this point.

109. Van Dijk, *SSA*, 23-26; Gordon, *Bi.Or.* 17 (1960), 123 with n. 17; Gadd, *Teachers and Students*, 13; Kramer, *Sumerians*, 243, 264.

110. Van Dijk, *SSA*, 23ff.

111. The relevance of the Akkadian term is noted by Gordon, *Bi.Or.* 17, n. 117. Examples are collected by Oppenheim, *Or.* 7, 133; *JAOS* 74, 11 and 12f.; *CADA*$_2$, 55bc, 57d, 62bc.

112. Cf. also *PRU* III, 20:24 for an example from Ugarit, if the translation of Moran, *ANET*^{3}, 629b (*contra* Nougayrol, *PRU* III, *loc. cit.*) is correct; Lambert, *BWL*, 267:I, 12-15.

113. *JNES* 11, 140-143.

114. Von Soden, *Or*. 38, 424 ("Verstand").

115. Lambert-Millard *ad loc*. This is Moran's intention too (*BASOR* 200, 53).

116. Since these passages occur in the context of the creation of man, they are a more apt parallel than En. El V, 76, cited by Moran, *op. cit.*, 53.

117. Oppenheim (Or. 17, 27 n. 1) prefers to restore *[dam]qata*, "you are [beau]tiful."

118. *Atrahasis*, 153 sub 223 ("personality").

119. *BASOR* 200 (1970), 52 ("the plan [of insurrection]").

120. See Tigay, "Garden of Eden," in the *Encyclopedia Judaica* (in press).

121. *JAOS* 40, 329-331.

122. Kramer, *JAOS* 64, 18f.; Lambert, *GSL*, 51.

123. Lambert, *GSL*, 51.

124. Kramer, *JAOS* 64, 18f. Cf. the discussion above, p. 82.

125. Cf. Gadd, *Iraq* 28, 107, for a suggestion that the Akkadian epic may have thought Enkidu was married before he came to Uruk.

126. Shaffer, 22 n:5.

127. As noted by Kirk, *Myth*, 145.

128. Dossin, *Bull. Academie Royale* 42, 592f.

129. On the question of whether Šamḫat is a name or a common noun see Diakonoff, *Bi.Or.* 18, 62 *sub* I, III, 41 etc., vs. Gadd, *Iraq* 28, 114 sub 11.

130. The translation follows Cagni; compare Speiser in *ANET ad* GE VI, 166. But the precise meaning of the terms is quite uncertain, and *CAD* Ḫ, 101b leaves them untranslated.

131. Note that Uruk is described as ki-zi-šà-gál-la, Hallo, *Bi.Or.* 23, 243: YBC 9859:23, 25; cf. *YNER* 3, 26:92.

132. So Reiner in *Languages and Areas*, 118.

133. For an anti-urban strain in cuneiform literature, cf. the remarks of Reiner, *ibid.*, and Hallo, *JCS* 23, 57f.

134. Kirk, *Myth*, 145f. In this Kirk was anticipated by Ungnad-Gressmann, *Das Gilgames-Epos*, 92-101, followed by Albright, *JAOS* 40, 320.

135. GE VII, iii, 35-48; cf. VI, 25ff.

136. GE I, v, 7f.

137. GE VII, iii, 31f.

138. For a discussion of *sābītu* and *siduri* see Gadd, *Iraq* 28, 116f.

139. Speiser, *ANET*, *ad loc.* For similar values cf. also the Pessimistic Dialogue (*BWL*, 139-149) and Jacobsen in Frankfort and Frankfort (eds.), *Before Philosophy*, 220, and especially the didactic passage from the Naram-Sin Epic quoted above, Ch. I, C, to be discussed below.

140. Translation based on Speiser, *ANET*, 98:33-35 and Shaffer, 110:207-209.

141. Translation based on Speiser, *ANET*, 98:42-45 and Shaffer, 110:217 - 110:220.

142. Landsberger, *GSL*, 33; Shaffer, 19f.

143. Cf. Gen. 3:22f.

144. E.g., *GETh.*, 8; *BWL*, 12.

145. Compare Eccl. 9:7-9 Isa 22:13; *ANET* 413d and 467c (Egyptian).

146. Kramer, *ANET*, 50f.

147. Cf. Seux, *Epithetes*, 154 s.v. *mahāru*; 345 s.v. *tību*.

148. Translation by Hallo, *JCS* 23, 57; cf. Reiner, *JNES* 17, 43 and *Languages and Areas*;cf. Gilgamesh, Enkidu and the Netherworld 229; other examples calling battle a holiday are cited in *CAD* I/J, 197b; Reiner, *JNES* 17, 43 n. 8.

149. *ARM* I, 69 rev. 13'.

150. Erra I, 15-20.

151. The text is quoted above, Ch. I.

152. Naram Sin 157.

153. See the discussion of Hoffner, *JCS* 23, 19.

154. Naram Sin 162.

155. Erra I, 17.

156. Erra I, 20.

157. Shaffer, 20.

158. *ANET* 467c; Isa. 22:13.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

In Ch. I, A we reviewed Jastrow's critical analysis of the Gilgamesh Epic and Kramer's empirical study of the epic's Sumerian sources. Kramer surveyed five Sumerian compositions dealing with Gilgamesh, plus the Sumerian flood story, all originally independent of each other, and showed that the flood story and three of the Gilgamesh stories were later taken up, in modified form, into the integrated Akkadian Gilgamesh Epic. Kramer presumed that several elements in the epic's plot chain leading up to the friendship of Gilgamesh and Enkidu, for which no Sumerian antecedents had been found, also had Sumerian forerunners, though not necessarily connected with Gilgamesh; at the same time he doubted that the epic's introduction had a Sumerian forerunner since it was, he believed, stylistically unparalleled in Sumerian literature. In Ch. II-VI we examined some of the events leading to the friendship and were able to confirm some of Kramer's presumptions. We agreed with his identification of the pukku incident in Gilgamesh, Enkidu, and the Netherworld as a forerunner of part of the chain (though we concluded that the Akkadian version had misunderstood the Sumerian original), and identified in certain genres and circles of traditions three more "models" for early parts of the epic: the creation of Gilgamesh, the creation of Enkidu, and the early life of Enkidu. True to Kramer's expectation, none of these models was originally related to Gilgamesh. In addition, all of them could be traced back to Sumerian literature, although in the case of the creation of Enkidu the closest known parallel was found in an Akkadian composition. In Ch. I, C we found Sumerian models even for parts of the epic's introduction, which Kramer had doubted could be paralleled in Sumerian literature.

In Ch. I, B we reviewed evidence which corroborated Kramer's assumption that the Sumerian Gilgamesh tales were separate and unrelated to each other. This was followed by a discussion of how their integration had been achieved - primarily by the changed role of Enkidu and the related search to transcend death. In Ch. I, C we saw how the individual episodes had been arranged in a meaningful sequence leading up to, through, and finally away from that search, with Enkidu's death becoming the turning point of the epic. In Ch. VI we argued that, as its response to the desire for immortality, the epic stressed the benefits of human life in lieu of immortality and portrayed Enkidu's early life as animal-like, and then described his rise to civilization, in order to contrast a life devoid of those benefits with one enjoying them.

In Ch. I, D we reviewed the evidence available for determining the ancient, native literary classification of the epic and earlier Gilgamesh literature. We found, on the one hand that the ancient categories were far more heterogeneous than the modern, but, on the other hand, that they corresponded at times to characteristics inherent in the literature itself, such as an Akkadian literary dialect typical of the "hymn" genre, and possibly pointed to a Sitz im Leben.

How does our study relate to modern literary criticism, both Biblical and general? For some years Wellek and Warren's Theory of Literature[1] has been a standard work in the field. Of interest to us is their final chapter, "Literary History."[2] They insist that the study of literary history is the study of development rather than mere change; it traces evolution toward a value or norm, rather than "ever new but meaningless and incomprehensible rearrangements."[3]

> [Only by] relating the historical process to a value or norm...can the apparently meaningless series of events be split into its essential and its unessential elements. Only then can we speak of historical evolution which yet leaves the individuality of the single event unimpaired.[4]

As an example of literary evolution Wellek and Warren discuss the subject of sources and influences.

> First of all, parallels must be real parallels, not vague similarities...Furthermore parallels must be exclusive parallels; that is, there must be reasonable certainty that they cannot be explained by a common source, a certainty attainable only if the investigator has a wide knowledge of literature or if the parallel is a highly intricate pattern rather than an isolated 'motif' or word.
>
> By a judicious study of sources it is possible to establish literary relationships. ...Most questions of literary relationships...require for their solution critical analysis, for which the bringing

> together of parallels is merely a minor instrument. The defects of many studies of this kind lie precisely in their ignoring this truth: in their attempts to isolate one single trait, they break the work of art into little pieces of mosaic. The relationships between two or more works of literature can be discussed profitably only when we see them in their proper place within the scheme of literary development. Relationships between works of art present a critical problem of comparing two wholes, two configurations not to be broken into isolated components except for preliminary study.[5]

Apropos of the discussion of sources it is observed that an author's originality is not compromised by his use of "commonplaces (topoi), recurrent themes and images..."

> To work within a given tradition and adopt its devices is perfectly compatible with emotional power and artistic value. The real critical problems in this kind of study arise when we reach the stage of weighing and comparing, of showing how one artist utilizes the achievements of another artist, when we watch the transforming power.[6]

Many of these principles are, or should be, operative in Biblical studies. The very fact that Biblical literary criticism begins with a final product means that by definition it is a study of evolution toward a norm. At the same time Biblists' interest in delineating the unique characteristics of the original documents protected their individuality, so much so that another principle - that literary criticism must compare wholes, not merely isolated components - tended to be ignored. The importance of pattern in alleged parallels was stressed by Albright and several others in the Biblical field.[7] Finally, the requirement that criticism compare wholes, not only components, has received a good deal of attention in Biblical studies lately.[8]

We may now attempt to relate these and other literary-critical principles and questions to our studies in the Gilgamesh Epic.

1. Sources. Our study, like Kramer's, has been oriented toward the discovery of "sources" or, as we preferred to describe them, "antecedents." Already in the introduction we raised the question of how similar a source must be to its alleged derivative to inspire confidence in the allegation. By comparing indisputably related texts we discovered that the demand for a complex pattern was not rooted in the reality of literary evolution, where derivative material is often thoroughly transformed. We cannot deny the high probative value of a complex pattern, but neither can we consider its absence necessarily damaging to an alleged relationship. Our discussion of this subject was based on literary materials borrowed from Mesopotamia into its periphery, but similar conslusions apply to inner Mesopotamian borrowing, too, since Kramer discovered in several cases that different versions of the same composition had in common little more than the bare outline of a plot.

These considerations were important in our choice of terms such as "antecedents" and "models" over "sources."

In Biblical studies "source" refers to a more or less lengthy compilation of literary units, which a redactor took over largely without change (save omissions, shifts of location, some attempts at harmonization, and relatively few additions) and joined to other such compilations. In our studies of the Gilgamesh Epic the "sources" were different enough from the derivative material that, in spite of our argument that this is not necessarily damaging to a direct relationship, it seemed better judgement to claim that the antecedent material reflected specific circles of traditions from which the derivative material was drawn, rather than urging that a particular piece of antecedent material which we happen to know of was the very source from which the derivative material came. Hence our preference for the terms "antecedents" and "models."

2. Analysis. We noted in Ch. I, A that Kramer's empirical study of the "sources" of the epic vindicated the "theoretical" approach in principle. This vindication does not apply to the disentangling of interwoven documentary sources, which was not attempted here,[9] but to the identification of originally separate literary units and motifs. What is paralleled is not the source analysis of the completed Pentateuch,[10] but that of the individual documents J, E, P, and D. The kind of analytical reasoning which concludes, for example, that the original unit in Genesis was the individual legend, and that legend cycles were only

formed later,[11] or that certain legends originally had other heroes than those with whom they are presently connected,[12] finds its counterpart in Jastrow's analysis of the Gilgamesh Epic, so that Kramer's confirmation of the latter supports in principle the critical analysis of Biblical literature as well, though allowance must be made for differing conditions in different cultures.

3. Sources, commonplaces, and originality. In Ch. III we concluded that the creation of Gilgamesh was modeled on a standard *topos* in royal inscriptions and was composed of clichés drawn from that *topos*. In Ch. IV we identified a literary pattern of oppression - outcry - divine response which had been taken up into the epic with a specific nuance apparently developed within creation literature. In Chs. V and VI we concluded that the creation and early life of Enkidu were modeled on the creation and early life of man as described in creation literature. The major episodes of the entire epic, as Kramer demonstrated, are all derived from earlier Sumerian versions. But despite his profound dependence on antecedent material the epic's redactor transformed that material into an expression of his own values (Ch. VI). We will have to await a study of the entire epic before we can determine to what extent he invented new material and to what extent he rather modified old material. The motif which dominates the Akkadian epic as a whole, the search to transcend death, was certainly

inherent, at least germinally, in the Sumerian material, so that the epic's theme was not invented out of whole cloth by the redactor.

The picture of this redactor as a creative influence is at variance with the view prevalent in 19th century Biblical scholarship that redaction was a largely mechanical operation.[13] But in recent years Biblical scholars have viewed the redactor's work more sympathetically. Although not many would go so far as to argue that the Biblical redactor recast his source material according to his own style and viewpoint[14] - a view which seems very close to what, following Kramer, we believe took place with the Gilgamesh Epic - even those who think his handling of source material was more conservative agree that his juxtaposition of materials was itself creative and gave the individual units a new meaning in context.[15]

The redactor of the Old Babylonian Gilgamesh Epic combined two roles which appear to have been distinct in the history of Biblical literature. It was not simply earlier literary sources which he adapted and combined, but literary sources taken over from another language and culture.[16] In the latter respect his work resembles the Israelite borrowing of ancient Near Eastern literature such as parts of the Universal History in Gen. 1-11.[17] When compared to this aspect of Biblical literary history the Akkadian borrowing

XUM

of Sumerian Gilgamesh tales appears to have been every bit as creative as the Biblical borrowing of ancient Near Eastern literature. And as in the latter case, it is not only in detail but in spirit as well that the borrowing reshaped the original material.[18]

4. Evolution toward a norm and comparison of totalities. The evolution of the Gilgamesh Epic was stressed in the very title of Kramer's 1944 essay.[19] As in Biblical studies the fact that scholars began with the final product imposed upon students of the Gilgamesh Epic an interest in studying the evolution of the material toward that norm. Our interest has not been in the various forms of Gilgamesh literature over the centuries, though that would be a legitimate study in its own right, but rather in those forms which played a role in the development of the final epic, or could shed some light on that evolution.

We have followed Wellek and Warren in rejecting an approach which considers the investigation complete when sources and antecedents have been discovered. In Ch. VI we sought to discover how some of the borrowed material advanced the message of the epic as a whole. We have not sought the significance of the borrowed material in its original contexts, since our interest was solely in the epic. By seeking the significance of the borrowed material within the epic, our discovery of antecedents was raised above the level of mere listing of parallels to a useful tool in interpreting the meaning the epic may have had for its ancient audience.

5. _Genre_. Wellek and Warren also discuss the meaning of _genre_:

> ...we must conceive of genre as a 'regulative' concept, some underlying pattern, a convention which is real, i.e. effective because it actually molds the writing of concrete works.[20]

We touched briefly upon the question of literary classification in Ch. I, D. There we shared the definition of genre as something with "actually molds the writing" by noting that in Akkadian literature the several literary types (which to modern minds are distinct) subsumed under the category "hymn" or "song" (_zamāru_) share a common literary dialect. We also attempted, in Chs. I, C and D, to relate the Sumerian and Akkadian Gilgamesh compositions to a _Sitz im Leben_ and alluded briefly to the possibility that the life situations we considered may have made some contribution to the content of the literature.

Beyond these general conclusions, other details may be of interest for Biblical studies.

6. _Competing versions_. The fact that two versions of Gilgamesh and the Land of the Living were listed in some literary catalogues, showing that both versions were

current simultaneously (Ch. I, B), may have implications for the relationship of the Pentateuchal documents to each other. Version B differs from version A mainly in its greater length. They are certainly interdependent, though whether the shorter or the longer version is the original has not yet been determined. They show at the very least that one version did not drive the other entirely out of circulation. If it can be shown that the shorter version was the original, the "supplementary hypothesis" will have a parallel.[21] If, on the other had, the reverse should be shown, Albright's view (above, 31f.) that literature generally develops by accretion, and that the present documents represent the maximum divergences found in the ancient traditions, would require modification.

7. Selectivity. Speiser and others have stressed that the Bible is selective, omitting traditional material which was not useful for its purposes.[23] This phenomenon was also encountered in our studies: two of the original Sumerian Gilgamesh tales were not taken up into the epic at all (Gilgamesh and Agga, The Death of Gilgamesh), while of a third (Gilgamesh, Enkidu and the Netherworld) only a single motif was taken up in the canonical version, the rest being partially incorporated in translation at a later date (GE XII).

8. Mutual awareness between independent episodes. While the Sumerian versions of the individual Gilgamesh

episodes were independent of each other (Ch. I, A and B), we noted some evidence that they may not have been written in total unawareness of each other (Ch. I, B). This raises a similar possibility for Biblical episodes as well, which would contradict Gunkel's view that "each individual episode must be interpreted first of all from within."[22]

In all this and more we are far from ready to draw specific conclusions for Biblical studies. We have simply discovered by studying a small part of a single composition, how much the empirically based literary criticism of cuneiform literature on the one hand resembles its more speculative counterpart in Biblical studies, and on the other hand suggests new possibilities which Biblists, depending on the Bible alone, might not have considered. There is no point in prejudging the question of how much Israelite and Mesopotamian techniques resembled each other. But at the very least we see that Mesopotamia provides "living" examples of how works of literature were created, offering Biblical scholars some real models for their own theories. This conclusion was not unexpected, but it could not become functional without the flesh and blood of real examples. We have made a beginning by providing a few.

NOTES TO SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

1. First published in 1948. I follow the third edition, 1962.

2. Ch. 19, pp. 252-269.

3. *Ibid.*, 255.

4. *Ibid.*, 257.

5. *Ibid.*, 258.

6. *Ibid.*, 259.

7. Above, pp. 23-25.

8. N. Sarna, *Understanding Genesis*, xxv; M. Greenberg, *Understanding Exodus*, 1-8. Cf. F. Rosenzweig, quoted by S. Paul, *Studies in the Book of the Covenant*, 28 n. 25.

9. A brief analysis of the flood story in GE XI was undertaken by Laessøe, *Bi. Or.* 13, 96, on the basis of comparison with the version in Atrahasis. It may be possible to make such an analysis of the long version (B) of Gilgamesh and the Land of the Living if it can be ascertained that the shorter version (A) is earlier than it. Conceivably strands from each of these versions may, upon examination, be discernable in the Akkadian version of this episode.

10. For an extrabiblical parallel to the joining of separate sources in the Pentateuch, cf. the reference to the Samaritan Pentateuch above, INTRODUCTION, n. 171.

11. Gunkel, *The Legends of Genesis*, 42-46.

12. E. g., Abraham and the Sodom legend (M. Noth, *The History of Israel*, 121 n. 1; cf. N. Sarna, *Understanding Genesis*, 143f.).

13. Cf. even recently the comment of Koch, *The Growth of the Biblical Tradition* (11): "...in...the Tetrateuch... literary types which were originally independent were merely strung together, and this has obscured the essential purpose of the book as a whole."

14. Cassuto, *Encyclopedia Miqrait*, II, 319f.; B. Jacob, cited by Hahn, *OTMR*, 36f.

15. Above, n. 8.

XUM

16. For a discussion of the extent to which distinct Sumerian and Semitic cultures can be distinguished see, *inter alia*, the articles published in *Genava* 8 (1960), 241-283, 297-314; Hallo-van Dijk, *YNER* 3, 6-11; Kraus, *Sumerer und Akkader*; Oppenheim, *AM*, 48-56; Edzard in J. Bottéro, *et al* (eds.), *The Near East: The Early Civilizations*, 57-64.

17. Kramer, *History Begins at Sumer*, 182, describes the Gilgamesh Epic as "The First Case of Literary Borrowing."

18. Cf. Kramer, *JAOS* 63, 70 n. 3; 64, 19; Sarna, *Understanding Genesis* xxviif. See Kramer's discussion of the origin of the differences, *JAOS* 64, 16 n. 60. Kramer argues that the Babylonian poets worked with Sumerian originals quite close to those we have, and that they consciously introduced the changes which characterize the Akkadian versions. He argues against the existence in Old Babylonian times of other written versions which differ markedly from those we know. An alternative explanation of the differences might be based on oral versions which influenced the Akkadian poets, but Laessøe has argued that oral tradition played a very small role in Mesopotamian literature (*Studia*...Pedersen, 205-218).

19. "The Epic of Gilgameš and its Sumerian Sources," *JAOS* 64, 7-23, 83.

20. *Op. cit.*, 261f.

21. See the remarks of Rofé cited above, p. 42.

22. Gunkel, *The Legends of Genesis*, 45.

23. Speiser, *Genesis*, XXXIX.

XUM

BIBLIOGRAPHY

An extensive bibliography of literature relating to Gilgamesh, compiled by L. de Meyer, was published in P. Garelli (ed.), *Gilgameš et sa legende* (*GSL*; 1960), 1-30. This was supplemented by L. Matouš, "Zur neueren Literatur über das Gilgameš-Epos," *Bi. Or.* 21 (1964), 3-10. As a rule literature listed there is not listed here. Also omitted are standard reference works and text-publication series and, with few exceptions, works consulted for this study but not referred to in the footnotes. The abbreviations used here and in the footnotes are those listed in standard reference works such as *AHw*, *CAD*, R. Borger's *Handbuch der Keilschriftliteratur* (1967), and the bibliographical compilations published annually in *Orientalia*.

The bibliography for the Introduction, which is a distinct entity in this thesis, has been separated from that of Ch. I-VI and the SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS.

INTRODUCTION

Ackroyd, P. R. and Evans, C. F. (eds.), *The Cambridge History of the Bible I* (1970).

Albrektson, B., *History and the Gods* (1967).

Albright, W. F., "Abram the Hebrew: A New Archaeological Interpretation," *BASOR* 163 (1961), pp. 36-54.

Albright, W. F., "The Amarna Letters from Palestine," Vol. II, Ch. XX, of *CAH*^{2} (Fascicle 51; 1966).

Albright, W. F., *Archaeology and the Religion of Israel*^{4} (1956).

XUM

Albright, W. F., "A Catalogue of Early Hebrew Lyric Poems," *HUCA* 33/I (1950-1951), 1-39.

Albright, W. F., *From the Stone Age to Christianity*² (1957).

Albright, W. F., "The Oracles of Balaam," *JBL* 63 (1944), 207-233.

Albright, W. F., "The Psalm of Habakkuk," in H. H. Rowley (ed.), *Studies in Old Testament Prophecy* (1950), 1-18.

Albright, W. F., "Recent Books on Archaeology and Ancient History," *BASOR* 139 (1955), 14-25.

Albright, W. F., "Some Canaanite-Phoenician Sources of Hebrew Wisdom," *VT Supp*. 3 (1955), 1-15.

Albright, W. F., "Some Oriental Glosses on the Homeric Problem," *AJA* 54 (1950), 162-176.

Albright, W. F., "A Teacher to a Man of Shechem about 1400 B.C.," *BASOR* 86 (1942), 28-31.

Albright, W. F., "An Unrecognized Amarna Letter from Ugarit," *BASOR* 95 (1944), 30-33.

Albright, W. F., *Yahweh and the Gods of Canaan* (1968).

Barton, G., *Ecclesiastes* (*ICC*. 1908).

Biggs, R., "The Abu-Salabikh Tablets," *JCS* 20 (1966), 73-88.

Buttrick, G. A., *et*. *al*. (eds.), *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible* (1962).

Cagni, L., *L'Epopea di Erra* (1969).

Cassuto, U., *The Documentary Hypothesis* (Hebrew; 1959).

Cassuto, U., *The Goddess Anath* (Hebrew; 1951).

Chiera, E., *They Wrote on Clay* (1938).

Çiǧ, M. and Kizilyay, H., *Zwei Altbabylonische Schulbücher aus Nippur* (*TTKY* 7/35; Ankara, 1959).

Cooper, J. S., "A Sumerian ŠU-ÍL-LA from Nimrud with a Prayer for Sin-šar-iškun," *Iraq* 32 (1970), 51-67.

Cross, F. M., Jr., *Studies in Ancient Yahwistic Poetry* (1950).

Cross, F. M., Jr., and Freedman, D. N., "The Blessing of Moses," *JBL* 67 (1948), 191-210.

Cross, F. M., Jr., and Freedman, D. N., "A Royal Song of Thanksgiving--II Samuel 22=Psalm 18," *JBL* 72 (1953), 15-34.

Culley, R., *Oral Formulaic Language in the Biblical Psalms* (1967).

Dahood, M. J., *Psalms* (Anchor Bible; 1966-1970).

Diakonoff, I. M., "A Babylonian Political Pamphlet from about 700 B.C., *AS* 16 (1965), 343-369.

Dijk, J. J. A. van, "Die Inschriftenfunde," *UVB* 18 (1962), 39-62.

Dijk, J. J. A. van, "La Motif Cosmique Dans La Pensee Sumerienne," *Acta Orientalia* 28 (1964), 1-59.

Dijk, J. J. A. van, *La sagesse sumero-accadienne* (1953).

Dillon, H., *Assyro-Babylonian Liver Divination* (1932).

Drower, M., "Ugarit," Vol. II, Ch. XXI(b), Ch. IV and V, of *CAH*^{2} (Fascicle 63; 1968).

Eissfeldt, O., *The Old Testament: An Introduction* (1965).

Falkenstein, A., "Zur chronologie der sumerischen Literatur," *CRRAI* 2 (1951), 12-27.

Falkenstein, A., "Der Sumerische und der Akkadische Mythos von Inannas Gang zur Unterwelt," in Erwin Graf (ed.), *Festschrift Werner Caskel* (1968), 96-110.

Finkelstein, J. J., "Ammiṣaduqa's Edict and the Babylonian 'Law Codes,'" *JCS* 15 (1961), 91-104.

Finkelstein, J. J., "The Antediluvian Kings," *JCS* 17 (1963), 39-51.

Finkelstein, J. J., "Hebrew חבר and Semitic **HBR*," *JBL* 75 (1956), 328-331.

Finkelstein, J. J., "A Late Old Babylonian Copy of the Laws of Hammurapi," *JCS* 21 (1967, publ. 1969), 39-48.

Finkelstein, J. J., "Mesopotamian Historiography," *PAPhS* 107 (1963), 461-472.

Finkelstein, J. J., "Sex Offenses in Sumerian Laws," *JAOS* 86 (1966), 355-372.

Finkelstein, J. J., "The So-Called 'Old Babylonian Kutha Legend,'" *JCS* 11 (1957), 83-88.

Frymer, Tikva S., "Sumerian Motifs of Creation: The Antecedents of the Atrahasis Epic I" (1967, unpubl.).

Gadd, C. J., "The Infancy of Man in a Sumerian Legend," *Iraq* 4 (1937), 33-34.

Garelli, Paul (ed.), *Gilgameš et sa Légende* (1958).

Gaster, T. H., *Thespis*^{2} (1961).

Ginsberg, H. L., *Kiṯḇē Ugarīt* (1936).

Ginsberg, H. L., "A Phoenician Hymn in the Psalter," in *Atti del XIX Congresso Internationale degli Orientalisti* (1935), 472-476.

Ginsberg, H. L., "Psalms and Inscriptions of Petition and Acknowledgement," in *Louis Ginzberg Jubilee Volume* (1945), 159-171.

Ginsberg, H. L., "The Quintessence of Koheleth," in A. Altmann (ed.) *Biblical and Other Studies* (1963), 47-59.

Ginzberg, L., *The Legends of the Jews* (six volumes, 1909-1928; Vol. VII, *Index*, by Boaz Cohen, 1938).

Goetze, A., and Levy, S., "Fragment of the Gilgamesh Epic from Megiddo," *ʿAtiqot: Journal of the Israel Department of Antiquities* 2, (1959), 121-128.

Gordis, R., *Koheleth--The Man and His World*^{3} (1968).

Gordis, R., "On Methodology in Biblical Exegesis," *JQR* 61 (1970), 93-118.

Gordon, C. H., *Before the Bible* (1962).

Gordon, C. H., "Homer and Bible," *HUCA* 26 (1955), 43-108.

Gordon, C. H., *Ugaritic Literature* (1949).

Gordon, C., *Ugaritic Textbook* (1965).

Gössmann, F., *Das Era Epos* (1955).

Greenberg, M., "Response to Roland de Vaux's 'Method in the Study of Early Hebrew History,'" in J. P. Hyatt (ed.), *The Bible in Modern Scholarship* (1965), 37-43.

Greenberg, M., *Understanding Exodus*, Part I (1969).

Grimme, H., "Babel and Koheleth-Jojakhin," *OLZ* 8 (1905), 432-438.

Gunkel, H., *What Remains of the Old Testament* (1928).

Gurney, O. R., "The Cuthaean Legend of Narami-Sin," *An. St.* 5 (1955), 93-113; *An. St.* 6 (1956), 163 f.

Gurney, O. R., "The Myth of Nergal and Ereshkigal," *An. St.* 10 (1960), 105-131.

Hadas, M., "Forward" to G. Murray, *The Rise of the Greek Epic*^{4} (1960), iii-vi.

Hahn, H. F., *The Old Testament in Modern Research* (1954; ^{2}1966).

Hallo, W. W., "Akkadian Apocalypses," *IEJ* 16 (1966), 231-242.

Hallo, W. W., "On the Antiquity of Sumerian Literature," *JAOS* 83 (1963), 167-176.

Hallo, W. W., "Checklist of Lexical Texts" (1967, unpubl.)

Hallo, W. W., "The Cultic Setting of Sumerian Poetry," in *Actes de la XVII*^{e} *Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale* (1969, publ. 1970), 123-133.

Hallo, W. W., unpubl. edition of the Erra Epic.

Hallo, W. W., and Dijk, J. J. A. van, *The Exaltation of Inanna* (*YNER* 3; 1968).

Hallo, W. W., "New Viewpoints on Cuneiform Literature," *IEJ* 12 (1962), 13-26.

Hallo, W. W., "Individual Prayer in Sumerian: The Continuity of a Tradition," *JAOS* 88 (1968).

Harrison, R. K., *Introduction to the Old Testament* (1969).

Haussig, H. W. (ed.), *Wörterbuch der Mythologie*, I (1965).

Heidel, A., *The Babylonian Genesis*^{2} (1951).

Heidel, A., *The Gilgamesh Epic and Old Testament Parallels*^{2} (1949).

Held, M., *mḫṣ/*mḫš* in Ugaritic and Other Semitic Languages (A study in Comparative Lexicography)," *JAOS* 79 (1959), 169-176.

Hummel, H. D., "Survey of Recent Literature," in H. F. Hahn, *The Old Testament in Modern Research*^{2} (1966), 263-310.

Hunger, H., *Babylonische und assyrische Kolophone* (*AOAT* 2; 1968).

Hyatt, J. P., "The Writing of an Old Testament Book," *The Biblical Archaeologist Reader* /I/ (1961), 22-31.

Jacobsen, T., "The Battle Between Marduk and Tiamat," *JAOS* 88 (1968), 104-108.

Jacobsen, T., *The Sumerian King List* (*AS* 11; 1939).

Jacoby, F., *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker* III C (1958).

Jastrow, Morris, Jr., "Adam and Eve in Babylonian Literature," *AJSL* 15 (1899), 193-214.

Jastrow, Morris, Jr., "Adraḫasis and Parnapištim," *ZA* 13 (1898), 288-301.

Jastrow, Morris, Jr., "On the Composite Character of the Babylonian Creation Story," in *Orientalische Studien---Nöldeke* II (1906), 969-982.

Jastrow, Morris, Jr., *The Religion of Babylonia and Assyria* (1898).

Kammenhuber, A., "Die hethitische und hurrische Uberlieferung zum 'Gilgameš-Epos,'" *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 21 (1964), 45-58.

Kaufman, Y., *History of Israelite Religion* (Hebrew; 1937-1956).

Kaufmann, Y., *The Religion of Israel* (translated and abridged by Moshe Greenberg, 1960).

Kitchen, K. A., *Ancient Orient and Old Testament* (1966).

Knudtzen, J., *Die El-Amarna-Tafeln* (1915).

Koch, K., *The Growth of the Biblical Tradition* (1969).

Koschaker, P., "Beiträge zum babylonischen Recht," *ZA* 35 (1924), 199-212.

Koschaker, P., *Rechtsvergleichende Studien zur Gesetzgebung Hammurabis* (1923).

Kramer, S. N., Review of A. Heidel, *The Babylonian Genesis*, in *JAOS* 63 (1943), 69-73.

Kramer, S. N., "Cuneiform Studies and the History of Literature: The Sumerian Sacred Marriage Texts," *PAPhS* 107 (1963), 485-527.

Kramer, S. N., "The Death of Gilgamesh," *BASOR* 94 (1944), 2-12.

Kramer, S. N., "The Epic of Gilgameš and its Sumerian Sources," *JAOS* 64 (1944), 7-23, 83.

Kramer, S. N., "Gilgamesh and the Land of the Living," *JCS* 1 (1947), 3-46.

Kramer, S. N., "Inanna's Descent to the Nether World," *RA* 34 (1937), 93-104.

Kramer, S. N., "Man's Golden Age: A Sumerian Parallel to Genesis XI.1," *JAOS* 63 (1943), 191-194.

Kramer, S. N., *Mythologies of the Ancient World* (1961).

Kutscher, R., a-ab-ba-ḫu-luḫ-ḫa: *The History of a Sumerian Congregational Lament* (unpubl. Yale Ph.D. thesis; 1967).

Labat, R., *Hémérologies et ménologies d'Assur* (1939).

Laessøe, J., "The Atrahasis Epic: A Babylonian History of Mankind," *Bi*. *Or*. 13 (1956), 98-101.

Laessøe, J., "Literacy and Oral Tradition in Ancient Mesopotamia," in *Studia* *Orientalia*... *Pedersen*... (1953), 205-218.

Lambert, W. G., "Ancestors, Authors and Canonicity," *JCS* 11 (1957), 1-14, 112.

Lambert, W. G., *Babylonian Wisdom Literature* (1960).

Lambert, W. G., "The Birdcall Text," *An*. *St*.20 (1970), 111-117.

Lambert, W. G., "Enmeduranki and Related Matters," *JCS* 21 (1967, publ. 1969), 126-138.

Lambert, W. G., "The Fifth Tablet of the Era Epic," *Iraq* 24 (1962), 119-125.

Lambert, W. G., "A New Look at the Babylonian Background of Genesis," *Journal of Theologic[illegible] Studies* 16 (1965), 287-300.

Lambert, W. G., Review of E. Ebeling, *LKA*, in *Bi*. *Or*. 13 (1956), 143-146.

Lambert, W. G., and Millard, A. R., *Atrahasis: The Babylonian Story of the Flood* (1969).

Landsberger, B., "Die angebliche babylonische Notenschrift," *AfO Beiband* I (1933), 170-178.

Landsberger, B., "Assyrische Königsliste und dunkeles Zeitalter," *JCS* 8 (1954), 31-45, 47-73, 106-133.

Landsberger, B., and Tadmor, H., "Fragments of Clay Liver Models from Hazor," *IEJ* 14 (1964), 201-218.

Leichty, E., *A Bibliography of the Cuneiform Tablets of the Kuyunjik Collection in the British Museum* (1964).

Leichty, E., "The Colophon," in *Studies Presented to A. Leo Oppenheim* (1964), 147-154.

Leichty, E., *The Omen Series Šumma Izbu* (*TCS* IV; 1970).

Leichty, E., "Teratological Omens" in *La Divination in Mesopotamie Ancienne* (*14^{e} Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale*; 1965, publ. 1966), 131-136.

Leiman, Sid Z., *The Talmudic and Midrashic Evidence for the Canonization of Hebrew Scripture* (unpubl. Pennsylvania Ph.D. thesis; 1970).

Levine, B. A., "Ugaritic Descriptive Rituals," *JCS* 17 (1963), 105-111.

Lord, A. B., *The Singer of Tales* (1968).

Machinist, P., "'Silbenalphabet A', a Bilingual Account of the Creation of Man, and the Atrahasis Epic" (1968, unpubl.).

Malamat, A., "Doctrines of Causality in Hittite and Biblical Historiography: a Parallel," *VT* 5 (1955), 1 ff.

Malamat, A., "Hazor 'The Head of All Those Kingdoms,'" *JBL* 79 (1960), 12-19.

Malamat, A., "Northern Canaan and the Mari Texts" in the *Nelson Glueck AV* (1970), 164-177.

Meissner, B., *Ein Altbabylonisches Fragment des Gilgamosepos* (*MVAG* 7/1; 1902).

Midrash Rabba, Wilna edition.

Montgomery, J. A., "Morris Jastrow, Jr.," *AJSL* 38 (1921), 1-11.

Moran, W. L., "The Creation of Man in Atrahasis I 192-248," *BASOR* 200 (1970), 48-56.

Muilenburg, J., "Form Criticism and Beyond," *JBL* 88 (1969), 1-18.

Murray, G., *The Rise of the Greek Epic*^{4} (1934; 1960).

Nielsen, E., *Oral Tradition* (1954).

Nielsen, E., *The Ten Commandments in New Perspective* (1968).

Nougayral, J., "'Vocalises' et 'Syllabes en Liberté' a Ugarit," *AS* 16 (1965), 29-39.

Oppenheim, A. L., *Ancient Mesopotamia: Portrait of a Dead Civilization* (1964).

Oppenheim, A. Leo, "Divination and Celestial Observation in the Last Assyrian Empire," *Centaurus* 14 (1969), 97-135.

Oppenheim., A. L., "Mesopotamian Mythology" I, *Or*. 16 (1947), 207-238; II, *Or*. 17 (1948), 17-58; III, *Or*. 19 (1950), 129-159.

Oppenheim, A. L., "A New Prayer to the 'gods of the night'," *Analecta Biblica* 12/III (1959), 282-301.

Otten, H., "Die Erste Tafel des Hethitischen Gilgamesch-Epos," *Istanbuler Mitteilungen* 8 (1958), 93-125.

Paul, S., "Exod. 21:10 a Threefold Maintenance Clause," *JNES* 28 (1969), 48-53.

Paul, S. M., *Studies in the Book of the Covenant in the Light of Cuneiform and Biblical Law* (*VT Supp*. 19; 1970).

Pfeiffer, R. H., *Introduction to the Old Testament* (1948).

Pope, M., *Job* (*Anchor Bible*; 1965).

Pritchard, J., *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament* (^{1}1950; ^{2}1955; ^{3}1969).

Rad, G. von, *The Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays* (1966).

Rainey, A. F., "A Canaanite at Ugarit," *IEJ* 13 (1963), 43-45.

Rainey, A., "The Scribe at Ugarit: His Position and Influence," *Proceedings of the Israel Academy of Sciences and the Humanities* 3 (1968), 126-146.

Rainey, A., "The Soldier-Scribe in *Papyrus Anastasi* I," *JNES* 26 (1967), 58-60.

Rainey, A. F., "Ugarit and the Canaanites Again," *IEJ* 14 (1964), 101.

Reiner, E., "The Etiological Myth of the 'Seven Sages,'" *Or*. 30 (1961), 1-11.

Reiner, E., and Güterbock, H. G., "The Great Prayer to Ishtar and its Two Versions from Bogazköy," *JCS* 21 (1967, publ. 1969), 255-266.

Rowley, H. H., *The Old Testament and Modern Study* (1951).

Sachs, A., "Babylonian Horoscopes," *JCS* 6 (1952), 49-75.

Sarna, N., "The Psalm for the Sabbath Day," *JBL* 81 (1962), 155-168.

Schaeffer, C. F. A., "Neue Entdeckungen in Ugarit (23. und 24. Kampagne, 1960-1961)," *AfO* 20 (1963), 206-215.

Schaeffer, C. F. A., et. al., *Ugaritica V* (*Mission de Ras Shamra* 16; 1968).

Segal, M. H., *The Pentateuch* (1967).

Shaffer, A., *Sumerian Sources of Tablet XII of the Epic of Gilgameš* (unpubl. Pennsylvania Ph.D. thesis; 1963).

Sjöberg, Å. W., and Bergmann, E., *The Collection of the Sumerian Temple Hymns* (*TCS* III; 1969).

Soden, W. von, "Bemerkungen zu einigen literatischen Texten in akkadische Sprache aus Ugarit," *Ugaritforschungen* I (1969), 189-195.

Soden, W. von, "Einge Fragen Zur Deutung des Altbabylonischen Atramhasis-Mythos," *Actes de la XVII^e^ Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale* (1969; publ. 1970).

Soden, W. von, "Das Problem der zeitlichen Einordnung akkadischer Literaturwerke," *MDOG* 85 (1953), 14-26.

Sollberger, E., "A Three-column *Silbenvokabular A*," *AS* 16 (1965), 21-28.

Speiser, E. A., *Genesis* (Anchor Bible; 1964).

Speiser, E. A., *Oriental and Biblical Studies*, ed. J. J. Finkelstein and Moshe Greenberg (1967).

Stamm, J. J., and Andrew, M. E., *The Ten Commandments in Recent Research* (1967).

Strack, H., *Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash* (1931).

Sweet, R. F. G., "A Pair of Double Acrostics in Akkadian," *Orientalia* 38 (1969), 459-460.

Tadmor, Hayim, "The Campaigns of Sargon II of Assur: A Chronological-Historical Study," *JCS* 12 (1958), 24-40, 77-100.

Tadmor, H., "Fragments of a stele of Sargon II from the excavations of Ashdod" (Hebrew), in *Eretz Israel* 8 (1967), 241-245 and pl. 41.

Talmon, S., "Double Readings in the Massoretic Text," *Textus* 1 (1960), 144-184.

Talmon, S., "The Structure of Biblical Books and Mesopotamian Scribal Customs" (lecture delivered at Yale University; 1971).

Thompson, R. C., *The Epic of Gilgamesh* (1930).

Tigay, J., "Biblical and Mesopotamian Antediluvian Traditions" (unpubl.; 1968).

Tigay, J., "Psalm 7:5 and Ancient Near Eastern Treaties," *JBL* 89 (1970), 178-186.

Tournay, R.-J., "Le psaume Composite," *RB* 54 (1947), 521-542; 56 (1946), 37-60.

Virolleaud, C., "Les Nouveaux Textes Alphabétiques de Ras-Shamra," *CRAIB* (1962), 92-97.

Virolleaud, C., "Un nouvel épisode du myth ugaritique de Baal," *CRAIB* 1960, 180-186.

Watson, D. W., *Text-Restoration Methods in Contemporary U. S. A. Biblical Scholarship* (1970).

Weidner, E. F., "Die Astrologische Serie Enûma Anu Enlil," *AfO* 14 (1941-1944), 172-195, 308-318.

Weidner, E. F., "Die Astrologische Serie Enûma Anu Enlil (Fortsetzung)," *AfO* 17 (1954-1956), 71-89.

Weidner, E. F., "Vocabular-Studien," *AJSL* 38 (1921/2), 153-213.

Wright, G. E. (ed.), *The Bible and the Ancient Near East*^{2} (*Albright AV*; 1965).

Wright, G. E., *Schechem* (1965).

Yamauchi, E. M., "Tammuz and the Bible," *JBL* 84 (1965), 283-290.

BIBLIOGRAPHY FOR CHAPTERS I-VI, SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Aelianus, Claudius, *On Animals*, E. T. by A. F. Scholfield (*LCL* Latin Authors, No. 446; 1958).

Ali, F., *Sumerian Letters* (University of Pennsylvania Ph.D. thesis; University Microfilms, 1964).

"Aspects du Contact Sumero-Akkadian," (*IX*^{e} *RAI*), in *Genava* N. S. 8 (1960), 241-314.

Astour, M., "Tamar the Hierodule," *JBL* 85 (1966), 185-196.

Bailey, J., "Initiation and the Primal Woman in Gilgamesh and Genesis 2-3," *JBL* 89 (1970), 137-150.

Bailkey, N., "Early Mesopotamian Constitutional Development," *Amer. Hist. Rev.* 72 (1967), 1211-1236.

Barnett, R. D., "The Epic of Kumarbi and the Theogony of Hesiod," *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 65 (1945), 100-101.

Bauer, Th., *Das Inschriftenwerk Assurbanipals* (1933).

Bernhardt, I., and Kramer, S. N., "Enki und die Weltordnung...," *WZJ* 9 (1959/60), 231-256 and Pl. I-XVIII.

Bernhardt, I., and Kramer, S. N.. "Götter-Hymnen und Kult-Gesänge der Sumerer auf zwei Keilschrift 'Katalogen' in der Hilprecht-Sammlung," *WZJ* 6 (1956/7), 389-395.

Biggs, R. D., ŠÀ. ZI. GA: *Ancient Mesopotamian Potency Incantations* (*TCS* II; 1967).

Binder, G., *Die Aussetzung des Königskindes Kyros und Romulus* (1964).

Borger, R., *Handbuch Der Keilschriftliteratur* I (1967).

Borger, R., "nisirti bārûti, Geheimlehre der Haruspizin," *Bi. Or.* 14 (1957), 190 ff.

Bright, J., *A History of Israel* (1959).

Buccellati, G., *The Amorites of the Ur III Period* (1966).

Budge, E. A. W., and King, L. W., *Annals of the Kings of Assyria* I (1902).

Burrows, E., Review of E. Chiera, *Sumerian Religious Texts*, in *JRAS* 1926, 318-319.

Cagni, L., *L'Epopea di Erra* (1969).

Castellino, G., "Les Origines de la civilisation selon les textes bibliques et les textes cuneiformes," *VT Supp*. IV (1957), 116-137.

Castellino, G., "Urnammu, Three Religious Texts, I," *ZA* 52 (1957), 1-57.

Cheyne, T. K., *Traditions and Beliefs of Ancient Israel* (1907).

Chiera, E., *Sumerian Religious Texts* (1924).

Childs, B. S., "The Birth of Moses," *JBL* 84 (1965), 109-122.

Cogan, M., "A Technical Term for Exposure," *JNES* 27 (1968), 133-135.

Cooper, J., "A Sumerian ŠU-ÍL-LÁ from Nimrud with a Prayer for Sin-šar-iskun," Iraq 32 (1970), 51-67.

Culley, R., *Oral Formulaic Language in the Biblical Psalms* (1967).

David, M., *Die Adoption im altbabylonischen Recht* (1927).

Dhorme, P., "La Fille de Nabonide," *RA* 11 (1914), 105-117.

Diakonov, I. M., "A Babylonian Political Composition of the 8-7th Centuries," *VDI* 1946/4, 41-53; summarized by E. Reiner, "Notes Bibliographiques," *RA* 44 (1950), 101.

Diakonov, I. M., "A Babylonian Political Pamphlet from about 700 B. C.," *AS* 16 (1965), 343-349.

Diakonov, I. M., Review of F. M. Th. Böhl, *Het Gilgamesj* Epos, and L. Matouš, *Epos O Gilgamešovi*, *Bi*. *Or*. 18 (1961), 61-67.

Dijk, J. J. A. van, "Les cóntacts enthniques dans la Mesopotamie et les syncrétismes de la religion sumérienne," in S. Hartman (ed.), *Syncretism* (1969), 171-206.

Dijk, J. J. A. van, "Lâ fete du nouvel an dans un texte de Sulgi," *Bi*. *Or*. 11 (1954), 83-88.

Dijk, J. J. A. van, "L'hymme a Marduk avec intercession pour le roi Abi'ešuh," *MIO* 12 (1966), 57-74.

XUM

Dijk, J. J. A. van, "Le Motif Cosmique Dans La Pensee Sumerienne ," *Acta Orientalia* 28 (1964), 1-59.

Dijk, J. J. A. van, *La sagesse sumero-accadienne. Recherches sur les genres litteraires des textes sapientaux* (1953).

Dijk, J. J. van, *Sumerische Götterlieder* II (1960).

Dijk, J. J. A. van, "Die Tontafeln aus der Grabung in E-anna," *UVB* 18 (1962), 39 ff.

Driver, S. R., *Genesis* (1904).

Ebeling, E., *Tod und Leben noch den Vorstellungen der Babylonier* (1931).

Edzard, D. O., *Die "Zweite Zwischenzeit" Babyloniens* (1957).

Eissfeldt, O., *The Old Testament: An Introduction* (Eng. tr. 1965).

Ellis, R. A., *Foundation Deposits in Ancient Mesopotamia* (*YNER* 2; 1968).

Evans, D. G., "The Incidence of Labour-service in the Old Babylonian Period," *JAOS* 83 (1963), 20-26.

Falkenstein, A., "Die Anunna in der sumerischen Überlieferung," *AS* 16 (1965), 127-140.

Falkenstein, A., "La cité-temple sumérienne," *CHM* 1 (1954), 784-814.

Falkenstein, A., "Zur chronologie der sumerischen Literatur," *CRRAI* 2 (1951), 12-27.

Falkenstein, A., "Fluch über Akkade," *ZA* 57 (1965), 43-129.

Falkenstein, A., Zu der Inschriftenfunden der Grabung in Uruk-Warka 1960-61. 4. Ein sumerisches Lied auf König Anam," *Bagh. Mitt.* 2 (1963), 80-82.

Falkenstein, A., *Die neusumerischen Gerichtsurkunden* (1956-1957).

Falkenstein, A., Review of S. N. Kramer, *Sumerian Mythology*, *Bi. Or.* 5 (1948), 163-167.

Falkenstein, A., "Zum sumerischen Lexikon," *ZA* 58 (1967), 5-15.

Falkenstein, A., "Sumerische religiöse Texte. 2. Ein Šulgi-Lied," *ZA* 50 (1952), 61-91.

Falkenstein, A., "Zu einem syllabisch geschriebenen Emesal-Text," *AfO* 16 (1952-1953), 60-64.

Falkenstein, A., and Soden, W. von, *Sumerische und akkadische Hymnen und Gebete* (1953).

Falkenstein, A., *Sumerische Götterlieder* I (1959).

Finkelstein, J. J., "Bible and Babel," *Commentary* 26 (1958), 431-444.

Finkelstein, J. J. "Hebrew חבר and Semitic *HBR," *JBL* 75 (1956), 328-331.

Finkelstein, J. J., "The Genealogy of the Hammurapi Dynasty," *JCS* 20 (1966), 95-118.

Finkelstein, J. J., "Mesopotamian Historiography," *PAPhs* 107 (1963), 461-472.

Finkelstein, J. J., "The So-Called 'Old Babylonian Kutha Legend,'" *JCS* 11 (1957), 83-88.

Finkelstein, J. J., "On Some Recent Studies in Cuneiform Law," *JAOS* 90 (1970), 243-256.

Frankfort, Henri, *Cylinder Seals. A Documentary Essay on the Art and Religion of the Ancient Near East* (1939).

Frankfort, H. and H. A. (eds.), *Before Philosophy* (1949).

Gadd, C. J., "Ebiḫ-il and his basket-seat," *RA* 63 (1969), 1-4.

Gadd, C. J., *Ideas of Divine Rule in the Ancient East* (1948).

Gadd, C. J. "Some Contributions to the Gilgamesh Epic," *Iraq* 28 (1966), 105-121.

Gadd, C. J., *Teachers and Students in the Oldest Schools* (1956).

Garrelli, P. (ed.), *Gilgameš et sa Legénde* (*VII^{e} RAI* [1958]; 1960).

Gaster, T. H., "Angel," in *IDB* I (1962), 128-134.

Gaster, T. H., "Myth and Story," *Numen* 1 (1954), 184-212.

Gaster, T. H., *Myth, Legend and Custom in the Old Testament* (1969).

Gaster, T. H., *Thespis* (^{2}1961).

Gordon, A. R., *The Early Traditions of Genesis* (1907).

Gordon, C. H., *The Ancient Near East* (1965).

Gordon, C. H., "The Glyptic Art of Nuzu," *JNES* 7 (1948).

Gordon, C., "Western Asiatic Seals in the Walters Art Gallery," *Iraq* 6 (1939) 3 ff.

Gordon, E. I., "A New Look at the Wisdom of Sumer and Akkad," *Bi*. *Or*. 17 (1960), 122-152.

Gordon, E. I., "Sumerian Animal Proverbs and Tables: 'Collection Five,'" *JCS* 12 (1958), 1 ff. and 43 ff.

Gordon, E. I., *Sumerian Proverbs: Glimpses of Everyday Life in Ancient Mesopotamia* (1959).

Gordon, E. I., "The Sumerian Proverb Collections: A Preliminary Report," *JAOS* 74 (1954), 82-85.

Grayson, A. K., and Lambert, W. G., "Akkadian Prophecies," *JCS* 18 (1964), 7-30.

Greenberg, M., *Understanding Exodus*, Part I (1969).

Gressmann, H., Review of M. Lewin, *Die Scholien des Theodor bar Koni zur Patriarchengeschichte*, *ThLZ* 30 (1905), 585-586.

Gunkel, H., *The Legends of Genesis* (1901; 1964).

Gurney, O. R., "The Cuthaean Legend of Naram-Sin," *An*. *St*. 5 (1955), 93-113; *An*. *St*. 6 (1956), 163 f.

Gurney, O. R., "The Myth of Nergal and Ereshkigal," An. St. 10 (1960), 105-131.

Hallo, W. W., "Antediluvian Cities," *JCS* 23 (1970), 57-67.

Hallo, W. W., "On the Antiquity of Sumerian Literature," *JAOS* 83 (1963), 167-176.

Hallo, W. W., "Beginning and End of the Sumerian King List in the Nippur Recension," *JCS* 17 (1963), 52-57.

Hallo, W. W., "The Coronation of Ur-Nammu," *JCS* 20 (1966), 133-141.

Hallo, W. W., "The Cultic Setting of Sumerian Poetry," in Actes de la XVII^e Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale (1969, publ. 1970), 123-133.

Hallo, W. W., Early Mesopotamian Royal Titles, (AOS 43; 1957).

Hallo, W. W., "Individual Prayer in Sumerian: The Continuity of a Tradition," JAOS 88 (1968).

Hallo, W. W., "The Lame and the Halt," Eretz-Israel IX (1969), 66-70.

Hallo, W. W., "New Viewpoints on Cuneiform Literature," IEJ 12 (1962), 13-26.

Hallo, W. W., and Dijk, J. J. A. van, The Exhaltation of Inanna (YNER 3; 1968).

Hallo, W. W., and Simpson, W. K., The Ancient Near East: A History (1971).

Harris, J. Rendel, The Story of Ahikar^2 (1913).

Hartmann, H., Die Musik der Sumerischen Kultur (1960).

Haussig, H. W. (ed.), "Wörterbuch der Mythologie I (1965).

Heimpel, W. J., "A New Look at the Heroes of Sumer," Lecture delivered to 181st Meeting of the AOS (1971), no. 13 in "Abstracts of Communications."

Heimpel, J., Terbilder in der sumerischen Literatur (1968).

Heinisch, P., Genesis (1930).

Held, M., "The Root ZBL/SBL in Akkadian, Ugaritic and Biblical Hebrew," JAOS 88 (1968), 90-96.

Höfer, O., "Seuechoros," in W. H. Roscher, Ausführliches Lexikon der Griechischen und Römischen Mythologie IV (1909-1915), 789.

Hoffner, H., "A Hittite Analogue to the David and Goliath Contest of Champions?" CBQ 30 (1968), 220-225.

Hoffner, H., "Remarks on the Hittite Version of the Naram-Sin Legend," JCS 23 (1970), 17-22.

Hoffner, H., "Symbols for Masculinity and Femininity: Their Use in Ancient Near Eastern Sympathetic Magic Rituals," JBL 85 (1966), 326-334.

Inglott, P. S., "The Structure of the Gilgamesh Epic," *Melita Theologica* 17 (1965), 1-19.

Jacobsen, Th., "Ancient Mesopotamian Religion: the Central Concerns," *PAPhS* 107 (1963), 473-484.

Jacobsen, Th., "Classical Statement: Man (The Epic of Gilgamesh)" in J. Neusner (ed.) *Report of the 1965-1966 Seminar on Religions in Antiquity* (Dartmouth College Comparative Studies Center, 1968).

Jacobsen, Th., "Early Political Development in Mesopotamia," *ZA* 52 (1957), 91-140.

Jacobsen, Th., "The Inscription of Takil-ili-su of Malgium," *AfO* 12 (1937-1939), 363-366.

Jacobsen, Th., "Parerga Sumerologica," *JNES* 2 (1943), 117-121.

Jacobsen, Th., "Primitive Democracy in Ancient Mesopotamia," *JNES* 2 (1943), 159-172.

Jacobsen, Th., "Sumerian Mythology: A Review-Article," *JNES* 5 (1946), 128-152.

Jacobsen, T., *The Sumerian King List* (*AS* 11; 1939).

Jacoby, F., *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker* III C (1958).

Jastrow, Morris, Jr., "Adam and Eve in Babylonian Literature," *AJSL* 15 (1899), 193-214.

Jastrow, Morris, Jr., "Adrahasis and Parnapištim," *ZA* 13 (1898), 288-301.

Jastrow, M., *The Religion of Babylonia and Assyria* (1898).

Jean, C. F., "L'Origine des choses d'apres une tradition sumerienne de Nippur," *RA* 26 (1929), 33-38.

Jensen, P., Review of R. Campbell Thompson, *The Epic of Gilgamesh A new translation...*, *OLZ* 1929, 643-654.

Jestin, R., "La conception sumerienne de la vie post-mortem," *Syria* 33 (1956), 113-118.

Kammenhuber, A., "Die hethitische und hurrische Uberlieferung zum 'Gilgameš-Epos,'" *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 21 (1964), 45-58.

King, L. W., *Chronicles Concerning Early Babylonian Kings* (1907).

King, L. W., *The Seven Tablets of Creation* (1902).

Kirk, G. S., *Myth: Its Meaning and Functions in Ancient and Other Cultures* (1970).

Kramer, S. N., "CT XLII: A Review Article," *JCS* 18 (1964), 35-48.

Kramer, S. N., "Cuneiform Studies and the History of Literature: The Sumerian Sacred Marriage Texts," *PAPhS* 107 (1963), 485-527.

Kramer, S. N. "The Death of Ur-Nammu and His Descent to the Netherworld," *JCS* 21 (1967), 104-122.

Kramer, S. N., *Enki and Ninhursag: A Sumerian "Paradise" Myth* (*BASOR* SS 1; 1945).

Kramer, S. N., *History Begins at Sumer* (1959).

Kramer, S. N. (ed), *Mythologies of the Ancient World* (1961).

Kramer, S. N., "New Literary Catalog from Ur," *RA* 55 (1961), 169-176.

Kramer, S. N., "The Oldest Literary Catalog. A Sumerian List of Literary Compositions Compiled about 2000 BC," *BASOR* 88 (1942), 10-19.

Kramer, S. N., *The Sumerians* (1963).

Kramer, S. N., "Sumerian-Akkadian Interconnections: Religious Ideas," *Genava NS* 8 (1960), 272-283.

Kramer, S. N., "Sumerian Literature a General Survey," in G. E. Wright (ed.), *The Bible and the Ancient Near East* (^{2}1965), 327-352.

Kramer, S. N., *Sumerian Mythology: A Study of Spiritual and Literary Achievement in the Third Millennium B. C.* (1944).

Kraus, F. R., *Ein Edikt Des Königs Ammi-Saduqa Von Babylon* (*SD* V; 1958).

Kraus, F. R., "Alt Mesopotamisches Lebensgefühle," *JNES* 19 (1960), 117-132.

Kunstmann, W. G., *Die Babylonische Gebetsbeschwörung* (*LSS* NF 2; 1932).

Kupper, J. R., *Les Nomades en Mesopotamie au temps des rois de Mari* (1957).

Laessøe, J., "The Atrahasis Epic: A Babylonian History of Mankind," *Bi. Or.* 13 (1956), 95-102.

Laessøe, J., "Literacy and Oral Tradition in Ancient Mesopotamia," in *Studia Orientalia...Pedersen...* (1953), 205-218.

Lambert, M., "La litterature sumerienne a propos d'ouvrages recents," *RA* 55 (1961), 177-196, and *RA* 56 (1962), 81-90.

Lambert, W. G., "Ancestors, Authors and Canonicity," *JCS* 11 (1957), 1-14, 112.

Lambert, W. G., *Babylonian Wisdom Literature* (1960).

Lambert, W. G., "A Catalog of Texts and Authors," *JCS* 16 (1962), 59-77.

Lambert, W. G., "Divine Love Lyrics from the Reign of Abi-ešuh," *MIO* 12 (1966), 41-56.

Lambert, W. G., "History and the Gods: A Review Article," *Or* 39 (1970), 170-177.

Lambert, W. G., "A Middle Assyrian Medical Text," *Iraq* 31 (1969), 28-39.

Lambert, W. G., "Morals in Ancient Mesopotamia," *JEOL* 15 (1957-58), 184-196.

Lambert, W. G., "A New Look at the Babylonian Background of Genesis," *Journal of Theological Studies* 16 (1965), 287-300.

Lambert, W. G., "The Reign of Nebuchadnezzar I: a Turning Point in the History of Ancient Mesopotamian Religion," in *The Seed of Wisdom: Essays in Honor of T. J. Meek* (1964), 3-13.

Lambert, W. G., Review of W. von Soden, *AHw* Lief. 5-6, *JSS* 12 (1967), 100-105.

Lambert, W. G., "Three Unpublished Fragments of the Tukulti-Ninurta Epic," *AfO* 18 (1957/8), 38-51.

Lambert, W. G., and Millard, A. R., *Atrahasis: The Babylonian Story of the Flood* (1969).

Landsberger, B., "Einige unerkannt gebliebene oder verkannte Nomina des Akkadischen," *WO* III (1964), 48-79, 246-268.

Landsberger, B., "Einige unerkannt gebliebene oder verkannte Nomina des Akkadischen," *WZKM* 56 (1960), 109 ff., 57 (1961), 1 ff.

Landsberger, B., "Jungfräulichkeit: Ein Beitrag zum Thema 'Beilager und Eheschliessung'" in *Symbolae..., Martino David Dedicatae* I (1968), 41-105.

Langdon, S. H., *Le Poeme Sumerien du paradis du deluge et de la chute de l'homme* (1919).

Laroche, E., "Mythologie Etrangere. XII, Gilgameš," *RHA* 82 (1967), 121-138.

Leichty, E., "The Colophon," in *Studies Presented to A. Leo Oppenheim* (1964), 147-154.

Leichty, E., *The Omen Series Šumma Izbû* (*TCS* IV; 1970).

Liebreich, L., "The Compilation of the Book of Isaiah," *JQR* 47 (1956-7), 114-138.

Liebreich, L., "Psalms 34 and 145 in the Light of their Key Words," *HUCA* 27 (1956), 181-192.

Lord, A. B., *The Singer of Tales* (1968).

Luckenbill, D. D., *Ancient Records of Assyria and Babylonia* (1926-1927).

Luckenbill, D. D., *The Annals of Sennacherib* (*OIP* 2; 1924).

McBride, S. D., *The Deuteronomic Name Theology*, unpubl. Harvard Ph.D. thesis (1969).

Malamat, A., "Campaigns to the Mediterranean by Iahdunlim and Other Early Mesopotamian Rulers," *AS* 16 (1965) 365-373.

Matouš, L., "Zur Neuren Literatur Uber Das Gilgameš-Epos," *Bi. Or.* 21 (1964), 3-10.

Meier, G., *Die Assyrische Beschwörungssammlung Maqlû*, (*AfO Beih.* 2; 1937).

Meissner, B., *Babylonien und Assyrien* (1920, 1925).

Meissner, B., *Beiträge zum assyrischen Wörterbuch II* (*AS* 4; 1932).

Mendelsohn, I., "Samuel's Denunciation of Kingship in the Light of the Akkadian Documents from Ugarit," *BASOR* 143 (1956), 17-22.

Millard, A. R., "Gilgamesh X: A New Fragment," *Iraq* 26 (1964), 99-105.

Moran, W. L., "The Creation of Man in Atrahasis I 192-248," *BASOR* 200 ~~(1970),~~ 48-56.

Muffs, Y., *Studies in the Aramaic Legal Papyri from Elephantine* (*SD* VIII; 1969).

Neufeld, E., "The Emergence of a Royal-Urban Society in Ancient Israel," *HUCA* 31 (1960), 31-53.

Noth, M., *The History of Israel*^{2} (Eng. Tr. 1960).

Oppenheim, A. L., *Ancient Mesopotamia: Portrait of a Dead Civilization* (1964).

Oppenheim, A. L., "The Seafaring Merchants of Ur," *JAOS* 74 (1954), 6-17.

Offner, G., "Jeux Corporels in Sumer. Documents Relatifs a la competition athletique," *RA* 56 (1962), 31-38.

Pettinato, G., "Die Bestrafung des Menschengeschlechts durch die Sintflut," *Or.* 37 (1968), 165-200.

Poebel, A., *Miscellaneous Studies* (*AS* 14; 1947).

Pritchard, J. B., *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament* (^{2}1950; ^{3}1969).

Ranoszek, R., Review of A. Schott, *Das Gilgamesch-Epos*, *ZDMG* 88 (1934), 209-211.

Redford, D. B., "The Literary Motif of the Exposed Child (cf. Ex. ii 1-10)," *Numen* 14 (1967), 209-228.

Reiner, E., "Le Char-de Ninurta et la Prologue du Mythe de 'Zu,'" *RA* 51 (1957), 107 ff.

Reiner, E., "City Bread and Bread Baked in Ashes," *Languages and Areas: Studies Presented to George V. Bobrinskoy* (1967), 116-120.

Reiner, E., "The Etiological Myth of the 'Seven Sages,'" *Or*. 30 (1961), 1-11.

Reiner, E., "Lipšur Sitanies," *JNES* 15 (1956), 129 ff.

Rofé, A., "The Texts of II Samuel 24 and I Chronicles 21 and their importance to biblical criticism and history of religion," lecture delivered to the 181st meeting of the *AOS* (1971), no. 20 in "Abstracts of Communications."

Rogers, R. W., *Cuneiform Parallels to the Old Testament* (1912).

Rogers, R. W., *The Religion of Babylonia and Assyria* (1908).

Römer, W. H. Ph., Studien zu altbabylonischen hymnisch-epischen Texten 1," in D. O. Edzard (ed.) *Heidelberger Studien zum Alten Orient* (*Falkenstein AV*), 185-199.

Roux, G., *Ancient Iraq* (1964).

Saggs, H. W. F., *The Greatness That Was Babylon* (^{2}1968).

Salonen, A., "Tupšikku und eine neue Phoneme der khalkolithischen Substratschicht," *Bi. Or.* 27 (1970), 176-177.

Sandars, N. K., *The Epic of Gilgamesh* (1960).

Sarna, N., *Understanding Genesis* (1966).

Schneider, M., "Pukku und Mikku. Ein Beitrug zum Aufbau und zum System der Zahlenmystik des Gilgamesch-Epos," *Antaios* 9 (1967/8), 262-283.

Schneider, V., *Gilgamesch* (1967).

Schrader, E., *Die Keilinschriften und das Alte Testament*^{3} (eds. H. Zimmern and H. Winckler; 1903).

Seux, M. J., *Epithetes Royales Akkadiennes et Sumeriennes* (1967).

Seyffert, O., *Dictionary of Classical Antiquities*, ed. Nettleship, H., and Sandys, J. E. (1956).

Shaffer, A., *The Sumerian Sources of Tablet XII of the Epic of Gilgames* (unpubl. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, 1963).

Sjöberg, A., "Contributions to the Sumerian Lexicon," *JCS* 21 (1967), 275-278.

Skinner, J., *Genesis* (*ICC*; ^{2}1930).

Soden, W. von, "Zum akkadischen Wörterbuch. 6-14," *Or.* 16 (1947), 66-84.

Soden, W. von, "'Als die Götter (auch noch) Mensch waren.' Einige Grundgedanken des altbabylonischen atramhasis-mythus," *Or.* 38 (1969), 415-432.

Soden, W. von, "Der hymnisch-epische Dialekt des akkadischen" *ZA* 40 (1931), 163-227; 41 (1933), 90-183.

Soden, W. von, "Das Problem der zeitlichen Einordnung akkadischer Literaturwerke," MDOG 85 (1953), 14-26.

Soden, W. von, "Sumer, Babylon und Hethiter bis zur Mitte des zweiten Jahrtausends v. chr.," in Propyläen Weltgeschichte I (1961), 523-609.

Sollberger, E., "The Rulers of Lagaš," JCS 21 (1967), 279-291.

Sollberger, E., Le systeme verbal dans les inscriptions 'royales' presargoniques de Lagaš: Contribution à la grammaire sumerienne (1952).

Sollberger, E., "The Tummal Inscription," JCS 16 (1962), 40 ff.

Speiser, E. A., Genesis (1964).

Stade, B., "Der Mythus vom Paradies Gn 2.3 und die Zeit seiner Einwanderung in Israel," ZAW 23 (1903), 172-179.

Streck, M., Assurbanipal und die letzten assyrischen Könige bis zum Untergang Niniveh's (VAB 7; 1916).

Tadmor, H., "'The People' and the 'Kingship' in Ancient Israel: The Role of Political Institutions in the Biblical Period," CHM 11 (1968), 2-23.

Thompson, S., Motif Index to Folk Literature I (1932-1936.

Thureau-Dangin, F., "La fin de la domination gutienne," RA 9 (1912), 111 ff.

Thureau-Dangin, F., "Notes assyriologiques," RA 10 (1913), 93 ff.

Tigay, J., "Garden of Eden" in Encyclopedia Judaica (in press).

Ungnad, A., Die Religion Babylonier und Assyrer (1921).

Ungnad, A., "Engidu," OLZ (1910), 306-7.

Vaux, R. de, "Les combats singuliers dans l'AT," Biblica 40 (1959), 495-508.

Weber, O., Die Literatur der Babylonier und Assyrer, ein Uberblick (AO Ergänzungsband 2; 1907).

Weidner, E., Handbuch der Babylonische Astronomie I (1915).

Weinfeld, M., "Cult Centralization in Israel in the Light of a Neo-Babylonian Analogy," JNES 23 (1964), 202-212.

Wilcke, C., Das Lugalbandaepos (1969).

Wilcke, C., "Eine Schicksalsentscheidung für den Toten Urnammu," *XVII^{e} RAI* (1969, publ. 1970).

Williams, C. A., *Oriental Affinities of the Legend of the Hairy Anchorite*, Part I (1925).

Winckler, H., Rezension zu *Bezold. Cat.*, *OLZ* I (1898), 52 ff, 69 ff., 107 ff.

Wiseman, D. J., *The Vassal-Treaties of Esarhaddon* (1958; = *Iraq* 20 [1958], 1-99 and pl. 1-53).

Wolff, H. N., "Gilgamesh, Enkidu, and the Heroic Life," *JAOS* 89 (1969), 392-298.

XUM

SUPPLEMENTARY BIBLIOGRAPHY

Biggs, R. D., "Le lapis-lazuli dans les textes sumériens archaiques," *RA* 60 (1966), 175ff.

Bottéro, J. *et al* (eds.), *The Near East: The Early Civilizations* (1967).

Bowman, Th., *Hebrew Thought Compared with Greek* (E. T. 1960).

Castellino, G., "Urnammu/Three Religious Texts (*continued*)," *ZA* 53 (1959), 106-132.

Civil, M. (ed.), *Materials for the Sumerian Lexicon* XII (1969).

Cory, I. P., *Ancient Fragments* (1876).

Cowely, A. E., *Aramaic Papyri of the Fifth Century B. C.* (1923).

Cross, F. M., Jr., *The Ancient Library of Qumran and Modern Biblical Studies* (1958).

Dossin, G., "Un rituel du culte d'Ištar provenant de Mari," *RA* 35 (1938), 1-13.

Ebeling, E., *Tod und Leben Nach den Vorstellungen der Babylonier* (1931).

Edzard, D. O., "Enmebaragesi von Kiš," *ZA* 53 (1959), 9-26.

Falkenstein, A., "Zu den Inschriftenfunden der Grabung in Uruk-Warka 1960-1961," *BagM* 2 (1963), 1-82.

Falkenstein, A., *Die Haupttypen der Sumerischen Beschwörung* (*LSSNF* 1; 1931).

Falkenstein, A., "Sumerische religiöse Texte, 1. Drei 'Hymnen' auf Urninurta von Isin," *ZA* 49 (1950), 80-150.

Finkelstein, J. J., "A Late Old Babylonian Copy of the Laws of Hammurapi," *JCS* 21 (1969), 39-48.

Finkelstein, J. J., lecture on the Atrahasis Epic, in J. Neusner (ed.), *Religions in Antiquity* (see Bibliography above, s.v. Jacobsen).

Genouillac, H. de, "Inscriptions Diverses," *RA* 10 (1913), 101 f.

Gevaryahu, H. M., "A Group of Notes on Scribes" (Heb.) in *Beth Miqra* 43 (1970).

Ginsberg, H. L., "Ugaritic Studies and the Bible," *BA* 8/2 (1945), 41-50.

Goetze, A., "Historical Allusions in Old Babylonian Omen Texts," *JCS* 1 (1947), 253-265.

Goetze, A., "The Chronology of Šulgi Again," *Iraq* 22 (1960), 151-156.

Goetze, A., Review of Alp, *Untersuchungen zu den Beamtennamen im hethitischen Festzeremoniell*, in *JCS* 1 (1947), 81-85.

Greengus, S., "The Old Babylonian Marriage Contract," *JAOS* 89 (1969), 505-532.

Gunkel, H., *The Legends of Genesis* (1964).

Gurney, O. R., *The Hittites* (1952).

Güterbock, H., "The Song of Ullikummi. Revised Text of the Hittite Version of a Hurrian Myth," *JCS* 5 (1951), 135-161; 6 (1952), 8-42.

Hallo, W. W., "Royal Inscriptions of the Early Old Babylonian Period: A Bibliography," *Bi*. *Or*. 18 (1961), 4-14.

Hallo, W. W., "Antediluvian Cities," *JCS* 23 (1970), 56-67.

Hallo, W. W., "New Hymns to the Kings of Isin," *Bi*. *Or*. 23 (1966), 239-247.

Hallo, W. W., Review of Edzard, *Die "Zweite Zwischenzeit" Babyloniens*, in *Bi*. *Or*. (1959), 234-238.

Hallo, W. W., "The Royal Inscriptions of Ur: A Typology," *HUCA* 33 (1962), 1-43.

Held, M., "The Root *ZBL/SBL* in Akkadian, Ugaritic, and Biblical Hebrew," *JAOS* 88 (1968), 90-96.

Jacobsen, Th., "New Sumerian Literary Texts," *BASOR* 102 (1946), 12-17.

Klein, J., "Sum. ga-raš-Akk. *purussû*," *JCS* 23 (1971), 118-122.

Klein, J., Review of Wilcke, *Das Lugalbandaepos*, in *JAOS* 91 (1971), 295-299.

Kramer, S. N., *History Begins at Sumer* (1959).

XUM

Kramer, S. N., Review of Falkenstein and von Soden, *SAHG*, in *Bi. Or.* (1954), 170-176.

Kraus, F. R., Review of *BagM* 2, *Bi. Or.* 22 (1965), 287-293.

Kraus, F. R., "Nippur und Isin nach altbabylonischen Rechtsurkunden," *JCS* 3 (1951).

Kraus, F. R., *Sumerer und Akkader*.

Krecher, J., "Schreiberschulung in Ugarit: Die Tradition von Listen und Sumerischen Texten," *Ugaritforschungen* I (1969), 131-158.

Labat, R., *Le caractère religieux de la royauté assyro-babylonienne* (1939).

Landsberger, B., "Aus der 3. Tafel DIR = *siiaku*," *ZA* 42 (1934), 155-166.

Landsberger, B., "Jahreszeiten im Sumerisch-Akkadischen," *JNES* 8 (1949), 248-297.

Landsberger, B., "Zur vierten und siebenten Tafel des Gilgamesch-Epos," *RA* 62 (1968), 97-135.

Laroche, E., "Un hymne trilingue a Iškur-Adad," *RA* 58 (1964), 69-78.

Lewy, J., "The Biblical Institution of D^{e}ror in the Light of Akkadian Documents," *Eretz Israel* 5 (1958), 23*-31*.

Lieberman, S., *Hellenism in Jewish Palestine*.

Loewenstamm, S., *The Tradition of the Exodus in its Development* (Heb.; 1965).

Millard, A. R., "A New Babylonian 'Genesis' Story," *Tyndale Bulletin* 18 (1967), 3-18.

Moran, W. L., "The Creation of Man in Atrahasis I 192-248," *BASOR* 200(1970), 48-56.

Moran, W. L., article on the Atrahasis Epic, *Biblica* 52 (1971), 51-61.

Moscati, S., *Ancient Semitic Civilizations* (1957).

Noth, M., *The History of Israel*^{2} (1960).

XUM

Nougayrol, J., "Note sur la place des présages historiques dans l'extispicine babylonienne" (*Annuaire, Ecole Pratique des Hautes Etudes, Section des Sciences Religieuses*, 1944-1945), 5-41.

Paul, S. M., "Deutero-Isaiah and Cuneiform Royal Inscriptions," *JAOS* 88 (1968).

Porter, J. R., "Pre-Islamic Arabic Historical Traditions and the Early Historical Narratives of the Old Testament," *JBL* 77 (1968), 17-26.

Rainey, A. F., *El Amarna Tablets 359-379* (*AOAT* 8; 1970).

Reiner, E., "Plague Amulets and House Blessings," *JNES* 19 (1960), 148-155.

Reiner, E., "More Fragments of the Epic of Era: A Review Article," *JNES* 17 (1958), 41-48.

Rofé, A., *Israelite Belief in Angels in the Pre-Exilic Period as Evidenced by Biblical Tradition* (Heb.; unpubl. Hebrew Univ. Ph.D. thesis; 1969).

Römer, W. H. Ph., "Studien zu altbabylonischen hymnisch-epischen texten (2). Ein Lied über die Jugendjahre der Götter Sîn und Išum," *JAOS* 86 (1966), 138-147.

Römer, W. H. Ph., "Studien zu altbabylonischen hymnisch-epischen texten (3). Ein Lied mit Bezug auf einen Subartum-Feldzug Hammurapis," *WdO* 4 (1967-68), 12-28.

Römer, W. H. Ph., *Sumerische 'Königshymnen' der Isin-Zeit* (1965).

Salonen, A., *Die Möbel des Alten Mesopotamien* (1963).

Sarna, N. M., Review of Loewenstamm, *The Tradition of the Exodus in its Development*, in *JBL* 85 (1966), 244-246.

Scharfe, H., "Threads and Texts," lecture delivered at the 1967 conference of the *AOS*, no. 63 in "Abstracts of Communications."

Schott, A., *Die Vergleiche in den Akkadischen Königsinschriften* (MVAG 30/2; 1926).

Shaffer, A., "The Mesopotamian Background of Eccl. 4:9-12" (Heb.), *Eretz Israel* 8 (1967), 247-250 (Eng. sum., 75*).

Shaffer, A., "New Light on the 'Three-Ply Cord,'" (Heb.), *Eretz Israel* 9 (1969), 159f. (Eng. sum., Eng. sect., 138f.).

Siegelová, J., "Ein hethitisches Fragment des Atra-ḫasis Epos," *Ar. Or.* 38 (1970), 135-139.

Sjöberg, A., *Der Mondgott Nanna-Suen in der Sumerische Überlieferung* (1960).

Sjöberg, A., and Bergmann, E., *The Collection of the Sumerian Temple-Hymns* (*TCS* 3; 1969).

Smith, M., "The Present State of Old Testament Studies," *JBL* 88 (1969), 19-35.

Smith, W. Robertson, *Lectures on the Religion of the Semites*^{2} (1914).

Soden, W. von, "Als die Götter (auch noch) Mensch waren. Einige Grundgedanken des altbabylonischen Atramhasis-Mythus," *Or.* 38 (1969), 415-432.

Thureau-Dangin, F., *Die Sumerischen und Akkadischen Konigsinschriften* (*VAB* I/1; 1907).

Ugaritica V (1968).

Weidner, E. F., "Historisches Material in der babylonischen Omina-Literatur, *MAOG* 4 (1929), 226-240.

Weinfeld, M., "Deuteronomy-The Present State of Inquiry," *JBL* 86 (1967), 249-262.

Wellek, R., and Warren, A., *Theory of Literature*^{3} (1962).

Wilson, J. V. Kinnier, "Hebrew and Akkadian Philological Notes," *JSS* 7 (1962), 173-183.

Yoffee, N., "Sumerian Antecedents of Enuma Eliš" (1968; unpubl.).

XUM